Government
Publications

SESSIONAL PAPERS

VOLUME 16

SIXTH SESSION OF THE TWELFTH PARLIAMENT

OF THE

DOMINION OF CANADA

SESSION 1916

VOLUME LI.

1091545

ALPHABETICAL INDEX

TO THE

SESSIONAL PAPERS

OF THE

PARLIAMENT OF CANADA

SIXTH SESSION, TWELFTH PARLIAMENT, 1916.

A

Auditor General's Report, Vol. I, Pts. a, b, and A to L; Vol. II. Pts. M to V; Vol. III, Pts. V to Z Vol. IV, Pt. ZZ.. 1
Agriculture, Report of Minister of, for year March 31, 1915.. 15
Agricultural Instruction Act, 1914-1916.. 15c
Acadia Coal Co. *re* granting of a Conciliation Board to employers of.. 99
Alien Enemy prisoners, escapes, etc., from detention camps at Banff, Alta.. 268
Alien Enemy prisoners, escapes, etc., from camp at Amherst, N.S.. 220
Amalgamated Dry Dock and Engineering Co. *re* construction of dry dock at North Vancouver.. 258
Amethyst, SS., correspondence *re* subsidy to, in years 1910-11, and 1911-12..
Appointments to Inside and Outside Service, in County of Wright.. 93
Archives—Report of works for year 1914. 29a
Astronomer—Report of Chief, year 1912. 25a

B

Bait Freezer at White Head., N.S.—Report of Engineer *re*.. 274
Bauman, W. F., an alien enemy—Correspondence *re* passport of.. 242
Bear River, N.S.—Documents *re* purchase of site for P.O. building at.. 142
Belzile, Louis de Gonzaque, *re* investigation respecting loss of horse by, during 1915.. 127
Bonds and Securities in Department of Secretary of State, since last return.. 69
Board of Conciliation—Documents *re* creation of, regarding Nova Scotia Steel Co., 1915.. 196
Bounty under Deep Sea Fisheries Act *re* County of Guysborough, N.S. 88
Bridge, construction of, between Ile Perrot and St. Anne de Bellevue, and Ile Perrot and Vaudreuil.. 168

B

Breakwater at North Lake, P.E.I—*re* construction of, at.. 164
Branch line of I.C.Ry. in Guysborough, N.S., *re* total expenditure connected with, since 1911.. 133
Burleigh Falls Water-power—*re* lease of by Government to J. A. Culverwell.. 280
British Columbia Hydrographic Surveys.. 25e

C

Campagnie de Navigation—*re* cancellation of subsidy contract to.. 223
Canadian Pacific Railway Company:—
Lands sold by during year 1915.. .. 54
Canadian Northern Railway Co.—Financial Statement of, etc.. 282
Canadian Northern Railway Co.—Copies of Mortgage Deed of Trust of, etc.. .. 282b
Canadian Officers employed in Canadian Pay and Records Office, London.. 207
Censors, names, etc., of employed by Government at Louisburg and North Sydney, N.S.. 195
Censors and decoders—List of employed at Halifax, since beginning of war.. .. 283
Civil Service, Inside, *re* questions asked of candidates for, since May, 1912. 247
Civil Service List of Canada for 1915.. 30
Civil Service Commission—Report of for year 1915.. 31
Commandeering of Wheat—Documents relating to, etc.. 162
Commandeering of Wheat—Documents relating to, etc.. .. .. 162a
Companies—List of at Halifax in Department of Militia and Defence *re* tenders for supplies 294
Commissions:—
Order in Council appointing Commission of inquiry *re* fire in Parliament Buildings.. 72

C

Commissions—*Concluded.*
Number of, etc., appointed since 1911.. 210
Order in Council appointing Commission to inquire into Shell Contracts.. 228
Re evidence taken respecting damages claimed against Militia Department by town of Sydney, N.S.. 239
Conciliation, Boards of—Report of Registrar of for 1915.. .. .. 36a
Conference of Local Governments held in Ottawa, October, 1915.. 86
Criminal Statistics, year ending 1914 .. 17
Cumming, J. S. W.—*re* action against by Government, etc.. 227
Customs Department at North Sydney—*re* renting of rooms for purposes of.. 114
Customs Station at Vicars, Quebec—Opening of at Frontier and closing at Vicars, etc.. 118
Customs Department—Number of clerks in paid from Outside Service vote who are in Inside Service.. 287
Customs, Report of Department of, for year 1915.. 35

D

Dairy and Cold Storage Commissioner—Report of for year ending March 31, 1915.. .. .. 15a
Dam, construction of at Grand'Mère, Co. of Champlain, Quebec.. 230
Decorations, list of awarded to members of Canadian Forces to March 17, 1915. 259a
Decorations, list of those in Canadian Expeditionary Forces receiving such.. 259
Desjardins, Auguste, of St. Denis, Kamouraska—Documents *re* appointment as Customs officer.. 68
Destructive Insect and Pest Act—Regulations under.. 46
Dionne, J. P., case of against the King in Exchequer Court.. 212
Dionne, J. P., Supplementary Returns *re* Exchequer Court.. .. .. 212a
Disallowance of Act of Legislature of Ontario—Order in Council, also report of Minister of Justice on.. .. .. 271a
Dominion Police Force—List of employees, with salary, etc.. 197
Dominion Police Force—*re* average number of men employed in year 1915.. .. 45
Dominion Steel Corporation, *re* war orders obtained by.. 178
Dominion Lands—Orders in Council *re*—between January 15, and December, 1915.. 47
Dominion Lands Act—Orders in Council *re*—between January 15, and December, 1915.. 48
Dominion Lands "Forest Reserves and Park Act"—Orders in Council *re*.. .. 49
Dominion Lands Survey Act.. 50
Dominion Government Domestic Loan—Copy of prospectus, etc.. 90
Domestic Loan of Dominion Government—Number of subscribers, etc.. 91
Doucett, Alex. D., investigation *re* claim of respecting cattle killed on I.C.Ry., 1915.. 131
Dredging:—
Inverness Co., N.S., in since 1896 to present.. 67
Contracts for supplies for dredges in East River, Pictou Co., years 1914-15. 139

D

Dismissals:—
Letters, etc., between Government and J. C. Douglas, M.L.A., *re* dismissals in Nova Scotia 97
Documents *re* dismissal of Daniel Buchanan as Pilot, Harbour of St. Anns. 107
Documents *re* dismissal of Clifford G. Brander, of Customs Service, Halifax. 113
Charles McCarthy from Customs Service at Halifax, N.S., etc.. 116
A. J. Crosby, Thomas Lynch and J. B. Naylor, Customs Service at Halifax. 117
W. B. Mills, Bridge and Building Master, Dist. No. 4, I.C.Ry.—Documents *re*.. 134
Proposed dismissal of present Keeper of Lighthouse at Cape Jourmain, Westmorland Co., N.B.. 144
John E. Hallamore, Postmaster at Upper New Cornwall, N.S.. 176
Mr. Bayfield, Supt. of Dredging in B.C., *re* dismissal of, and appointment of J. L. Nelson.. 183
Joseph Fleming on Intercolonial Ry... 188
Hubert Paquin, Postmaster of St. Gilbert de Portneuf.. 189
Documents *re* dismissal of Postmasters of St. Lazare, Vaudreuil Station, Point Fortune, Val des Epoulés, Mont Oscar, St. Justine de Newton.. 190
Dr. W. T. Patton, Department of Interior.. 24
L. F. Sansfaçon, Postmaster of Louisville.. 225
Postmaster McRitchie, of North River Centre, N.S.. 232
James Hall, Postmaster of Milford Haven Bridge, N.S.. 233
J. B. Levesque, Steward on steamer *Champlain*.. 277
Dr. W. T. Patton, Veterinary Inspection Branch at Coutts, Alberta.. .. .. .. 211a
J. B. Deschenes and Thos Bernier, employees on I.C.Ry. at River du Loup. 292
Mr. Chisholm, Inspector of Indian Agencies, Sask.. 191
South area of Alberta—Correspondence *re*.. 243
Duties rebated to importers during year ended December 31, 1915.. 112

E

East River of Pictou—Reports on depths of water in locks in, etc.. 98
East River of Pictou—Supplementary return relating to.. .. .. 98a
Estimates.. 3
Estimates, Supplementary, year ending March 31, 1916.. 4
Estimates, Further Supplementary, year ending March 31, 1916 5
Estimates, Further Supplementary, year ending March 31, 1917.. .. .. 5a
Estimates, Further Supplementary, year ending March 31, 1917.. .. .. 5b
Elevator—Storage at Calgary *re* location of.. 297
Electoral Polling Divisions in Manitoba—*re* apportioning of by Judges under Act. 234
Elections, By—return *re* year of 1915. ..
Employees in Government Departments—names of all who have enlisted since August 4, 1914.. 289

E

European War—Memo. *re* work of Department of Militia and Defence from 1915 to 1916.. 231
Examiners or Inspectors of materials for military purposes—Number of, etc.. .. 193
Examination for Civil Service appointments—Names of persons successfully passing in Prov. of Quebec 94
Expenditures, showing all sums expended in present year to December 31, 1915, by Dept. of Public Works, chargeable to Income.. 140
Experimental Farm, Rosthern, Sask.. .. 87
Experimental Farms—Report of the Director of, for year ending Mar. 31, 1915, Vol. I.. 16
External Affairs—Report for year ended March 31, 1915.. .. .. 29*a*
Extract from Montreal "Gazette" of January 12, 1915, *re* distress in England, etc.. .. .. 198*a*
Extract from Montreal Gazette, of November 1, 1915, *re* help by sale of Canadian flour.. 198
European War—Copies of Documents, Orders in Council *re*.. 42
European War—Copies of Documents, supplement to.. .. .. 42*a*
European War—Orders in Council relating to, from April 29, 1915, to January 12, 1916.. 43

F

Fair Wage Officer—Visits of *re* schedule of wages in shell making, New Glasgow, N.S.. 214
Federal Plan Commission for cities of Ottawa and Hull—Report of for 1915.. 172
Fenian Raid Bounty:—
Application of Aenas McKinnon of Nova Scotia *re*.. 95
Application of Aenas McKinnon of Nova Scotia *re*.. .. .. 95*a*
Names and addresses of persons in Annapolis Co. to whom paid.. 152
Names and addresses in South Cape Breton to whom paid, etc.. 153
Names and addresses of persons in County of Halifax, N.S., to whom paid.. 154
Names and addresses of persons in County of Hants, N.S., to whom paid. 155
Names and addresses of persons in county of Richmond, N.S., to whom paid 156
Re David W. McLean, Windsor, N.S.. 205
Re application of Mrs. Flora McIntyre, N.S.. 194
To whom paid in Queens Co., N.S... 149
Finance Department—Number of clerks belonging, paid outside service vote.. 265
Fire Protection on Transcontinental Ry. line between Harvey Junction and W. boundary line.. 278
"Forest Reserves and Park Act"—Orders in Council *re*.. 49
Fort Henry—Amount of money paid out for new buildings and repairs in 1912-13-14-15.. 283
Fisheries Branch, Department of Naval Service—Forty-eighth Annual Report of.. 39

G

Geographic Board Report of for 1915.. 25*d*
Geological Survey—Department of Mines, year 1914.. 26
Georgian Bay Canal—Interim Report of Commission *re* economic problem of.. .. 19*b*
Governor General's Warrants issued since on account of 1915-16.. 63
Grand Trunk Pacific Railway:—
Financial Statement of, etc.. 282
Copies of Mortgage Deed of Trust, etc. 282*a*

H

Hanlover, documents *re* repairs on in County of Shelburne, N.S., in 1915.. 166
Hansard—Report containing motion of Sir W. Laurier *re* expenditure made by Shell Committee.. .. .. 228*a*
Headquarters Staff of 1st, 2nd and 3rd Divisional Area—Names, rank, and qualifications of officers on.. 192
High Cost of Living—R port of Board of Inquiry into.. 84
Homestead Lands—Fractional Areas of in Saskatchewan.. 89
Horses—Correspondence *re* purchase of, etc.. 213
Horses, *re* number bought for remounts in Alberta, etc.. 236

I

Indian Affairs, Department of—Report of for year 1915.. 27
Inland Revenue—Number, names, salaries, etc., of permanent employees in, 1915, 1916.. 260
Insurance—Report of Superintendent of for year 1915.. 8
Insurance—Abstract of Statements of, year ended December 31, 1915.. 9
Interior—Report of Department of for year 1915.. 25
International Nickel Co.—Correspondence of with the Prime Minister.. 78
International Commission pertaining to St. John River—Report of.. 180
Investigation into conduct of officials in Customs service at Halifax, N.S., in year 1915.. 111
Irrigation Act—Orders in Council relating to.. 52
Inland Revenue—Reports, Returns, and Statistics of, for years ended March 31, 1915:—
Part I—Excise.. 12
Part II—Inspection of Weights and Measures, Gas and Electricity.. 13
Part III—Adulteration of Food.. 14
Intercolonial Railway:—
Relating to transfer by estate of Alex. Fraser, of River du Loup, of lot of land to.. 171
Relating to construction of viaduct at Amqui, at Traverse Dubé crossing .. 235

J

Justice—Report of Minister of *re* Penitentiaries of Canada, 1915.. 34

K

Kastella, A., *re* appointment as Mechanical Supt. of Dredges; also resignation of same.. 229

L

Labour—Report of Department of for year 1915.. 36
Launch Way and Boat House—construction of at Bear Cove Beach, N.S. 216
Lavoie, Geo., investigation *re* burning of barn of May 23, 1914.. 129
Law, Rt. Hon. Bonar—Communication from *re* using strength of Empire in the War.. 76
Lightkeeper at Cape Jourmain, Westmorland Co., N.B., *re* proposed retirement of.. 144
Lightkeeper at Arisaig, N.S., *re* appointment at.. 244
Librarians of Parliament—Joint Report of.. 40
Liquor brought into Territories of Canada from outside countries.. 55
List of Shipping for year 1915.. 22
Loan—Dominion Government Domestic .. 90
Loan—Dominion Government Domestic—Number of subscribers, etc.. 91

M

Manitoba Hydrographic Surveys... .. .. 25*f*
Manufacturers' Association, Canadian—Correspondence of with Prime Minister. 77
Mails, etc.:—
Relating to mail contract from Noel to Maitland, N.S.. 101
Rural delivery route, Shefford County, "Warden No. 1".. 102
Different rural mail routes in Strathcona County.. 103
Different rural mail routes in Strathcona—Supplementary return *re*.. .. 103*a*
Rural mail routes of Hodson and Toney Mills, Pictou County, N.S.. 104
Lemon Ferry Co., of Richmond, N.S., *re* carrying mail across 105
Number of rural delivery routes opened in 1915, name of counties in, etc 106
Re contract for carrying mails between St. François de Montmagny and railway station, years 1914-15.. 108
Re contract for carrying mails between Roberta, Co. of Richmond, and West Bay, Co. of Inverness.. 109
Re contract for carrying mails between Medicine Hat and Eagle Butte, Co. of Medicine Hat.. 110
Re rural mail route between Pictou and West River, N.S.. 119
Re different mail routes in constituency of Qu'Appelle.. 120
Re contract for carrying mails between St. Jean, P.Q., and railway stations of C.P.R. Co., G.T.R. Co., and Vermont Central.. 121
Re rural mail route from Eureka to Sunnybrae in Co. of Pictou.. 122
Re contract for carrying mail to Upper Margaree post office and Gillies P.O. 123
Re contract for carrying mail to Margaree Harbour and Cheticamp.. .. 124
Re names, amounts, etc., of tenders for carrying of mails in Counties of L'Assomption and Montcalm.. 147
Re mail routes in constituency of Regina.. 163
Re contract for carrying mail from Inverness to Margaree Harbour.. .. 174
Re contract for carrying mail between tram cars and Glace Bay, South Cape Breton.. 175

M

Mails, etc.—*Concluded.*
Re contract for carrying mail to Eastern Harbour and Pleasant Bay.. .. 177
Different mail routes in constituency of Medicine Hat.. 187
Re delay in establishment of in constituency of Medicine Hat.. .. .. 187*a*
Rural mail route, *re* establishing of from Alma, through Sy vester, N.S. 221
Rural mail route, *re* establishing of from Scotsburn to North Scotsburn, etc.. 222
Marine and Fisheries—Report of for the year 1914-1915 (Marine).. 21
Macdonald, Rev. Isaac Hunter, application of for position as Chaplain.. .. 270
Machine Guns—Amounts contributed for from Medicine Hat.. 199
Matapedia, Lake—Concerning surveys of made in 1914.. 184
Medical Examiners of recruits—names, etc., of appointed since b ginning of war to date, 1916.. 260
Medical Doctors—Number of employed by Militia Department at Halifax.. 256
Members of House of Commons and Legislatures of Canada in service, names, etc.. 250
Medical Officers employed in examination of recruits in county of Pictou, 1914-15.. 151
Memorial Tablet—Documents *re* placing of, on P.O. building, New Glasgow, commemorating late Rev Dr. James MacGregor.. 138
Mennonite Church—*re* conference between Minister of Agriculture and, in 1873.. 203
Militia Council—Report of, for year 1915. 35
Militia General Orders promulgated between November, 1914, and December, 1915.. 56
Military building at Rigaud—Correspondence relating to.. 252
Mines Branch—Report of year 1916.. .. 26*a*
Miscellaneous Unforeseen Expenses from April, 1915, to January, 1916.. 58
Montreal Street Ry. Co.—Copy of war orders given to.. 179
Moncton, N.B., *re* names, salaries of employees in I.C.Ry. offices at, also retiring allowances granted, etc.. 135
Morin, Nazaire, and Hébert, Napoléon, *re* investigation held respecting case of. 128

Mc

McNair's Cove, N.S., *re* expenditure at.. 217
McIntyre, Mrs. Flora—Documents *re* application of, for Fenian Raid Bounty.. 194
McKinnon, of Inverness Co., N.S., *re* Fenian Raid Bounty.. 95
McLean, David W., Windsor, N.S., *re* Fenian Raid Bounty paid to.. 205
McQueen Siding, *re* installation of and removal thereof subsequently.. 132
McTavish, Hon. D. B., appointment of as Commissioner *re* fire Parliament Buildings.. 72
McQueen Siding on I.C.Ry., *re* installation of and subsequent removal of.. .. 132*a*

N

National Battlefields Committee—Receipts and Expenditures, 1915 61

N

Naval Service:—
Report of the Department of, for year ending March 31, 1916.. 38
Regulations *re* payment to officers as interpreters.. 74
Copies of Orders in Council *re* Regulations of Department of.. 41
Nickel:—
International Co.—Correspondence of, with Prime Minister.. 78
Order in Council *re* prohibition of exportation of.. 215

O

Oliver Equipments purchased since August 1, 1914, names from whom purchased, etc.. 66
Orders in Council—Copies of *re* regulations of Naval Service.. 41
Ottawa Improvement Commission—Statement of Receipts and Expenditures, 1915.. 60
Overtime paid to men in Printing Bureau, from January 1, 1916, to April 1, 1916. 261

P

Parliament Buildings Fire—Report of Commission appointed to inquire *re*.. 72*a*
Patton, Dr. W. T., *re* dismissal of, etc.. 211
Paul, Capt. Stephen, claim of *re* steamer *Rhoda*.. 96
Patrol Boat A, "Captain Blackford"—Documents *re* repairs in December, 1914 to 1915.. 160
Patriotic Fund, unclaimed balances in banks for.. 159
Patenaude, Hon. E., and Nantel, Hon. W. B., showing amounts spent for furnishing offices of.. 170
Pensions to Canadian Expeditionary Forces, pay allowances for disabled soldiers, also to dependents, etc. 150
Pension list in force in Canada for disabled soldiers—Copy of.. 185
Petitions received by Government *re* disallowance of Act of Ontario Legislature. 271
Pictou—Documents *re* handling freight and coal at.. 299
Pictou Harbour—*re* permanent harbour quay line at.. 288
Pictou Harbour—*re* survey of for proposed new bridge.. 254
Pilot Commissioners—Harbour and District of St. Anns, Co. of Victoria, *re* dismissal of Daniel Buchanan.. 107
Pinlanski, W., *re* patent of, in township 25, range 4, office file No. 1752484.. .. 82
Port Morien, N.S.,—*re* repairs to Breakwater at, year 1915.. 143
Port Nelson—Statement total expenditure of public money at, to date, etc.. 291
Post Office Department—*re* amounts expended by, in connection with Yukon service for 1915.. 224
Postmaster General—Report of, for year ended March, 1915.. 24
Post Office at Louiseville—Documents *re* construction of, at.. 169
Post Office and Postmaster of parish of St. Esprit—Correspondence *re*, from October, 1911, to date.. 173
Post Office at Rigaud—Correspondence *re* cost of.. 186

P

Postmaster at West Roachdale, N.S., *re* appointment of, etc.. 200
Prince Rupert—Documents *re* proposed public building in, for Post Office, etc. 182
Pringle, Robt. A., copy of Order in Council appointing as Commissioner *re* Parliament Buildings Fire 72
Printing and Stationery:—
Report of Department of, 1915.. 32
Amount of money paid out for printing outside of Printing Bureau, in years 1912-13-14-15.. 285
Public Service—Names of all employees of all branches of, in Counties of Province of Nova Scotia 284
Public Accounts of Canada, year ended March 31, 1915.. 2
Public Works—Report of Minister of, for year ended March 31, 1915.. 19
Public Works—Return showing sums expended, chargeable to Income, year end December 31, 1915.. 140
Public Works—Return showing all sums expended, chargeable to Capital Account, year ending December 31, 1915. 141

Q

Quarantine de Lévis—Documents, etc., *re* purchase of land for.. 71
Quarantine Buildings at McNab's and Lawlor's Islands—Proposed use of, for Military.. 145
Quarantine purposes—Names and salaries of all Medical Officers appointed for, at principal ports of Canada, etc.. 146
Quebec and Saguenay Railway—*re* purchase of, by Government.. 281
Quebec, Montmorency and Charlevoix Railway—Reports of Engineers, *re*.. .. 295
Quebec, Montmorency and Charlevoix Railway—Correspondence *re* sale of, to Government of Canada.. .. .. 295*a*

R

Rallier du Baty—Communication from Sir G. Perley *re* report on Hospital at Dinard.. 75
"Railway Belt Water Act"—Orders in Council *re*, from Jan. 12, 1915, to December 31, 1915.. 51
Railways and Canals—Report of Department of, for year from April 1, 1914.. 20
Railway Commissioners—Report of Board of, for year ending March 31, 1916.. .. 20*c*
Railway Statistics of Dominion of Canada, year ended June 30, 1915.. .. .. 20*b*
Railway from Sunnybrae—Surveys *re* during 1915.. 208
Railway Subsidies in Canada—Amounts in years 1912, 1913, 1914 and 1915.. .. 251
Recruiting in England *re* direction of, etc. 269
Recruiting Officers for Counties of Lunenburg, Queens-Shelburne and Yarmouth, N.S., names of, etc.. 248
Recruits—Number of, up to April 1, 1916 (Senate).. 267
Recruits—*re* parties employed to obtain, etc.. 249
Regina, constituency of—Rural mail routes in.. 163
Regina "Province" and "Standard," Moosejaw "News" and "Saskatchewan Star," re amounts paid to, by Government, 1914, 1915.. 246

R

Remissions and Refunds, Tolls or Duties, year ending March 31, 1915.. 65
Revenue collected—Amount of, during fiscal year up to December 31, 1915, General Tariff, Preferential Tariff and Surtax.. 115
Revenue of Canada for years 1909-10-11, also amounts for agriculture.. 126
Roy, J. Antime—Correspondence with *re* farm purchase.. 257
Royal Northwest Mounted Police:—
Agreement of Dom. Govt. and Prov. of Saskatchewan *re*.. 81
Agreement of Dom. Govt. and Prov. of Alberta *re*.. 80
Report of, for 1915.. 28
Royal Society of Canada—Statement of affairs of, for year ended April 30, 1915. 59
Royal Naval Reserve Officers—*re* payment of missing allowance to.. .. .. 74*a*
Royal Military College:—
Re complaints as to manner of supplying clothing to.. 219
Amount paid out for new buildings and repairs in 1912-13-14-15.. 283
Rules of Supreme Court of Alberta 44

S

Salaries paid to employees in different Departments of the Government, Co. of Cumberland, from 1896 to 1911.. 125
Sealers of British Columbia—Reports on claims of, under last Treaty with U.S.. 79
Secretary of State for Canada—Report of, for year 1915.. 29
Seed Grain Liens—Documents in connection with Government's decision to exact.. 262
Senate of Canada—*re* amendment of B.N.A. Act in reference to.. 244
Sherwood, H. Crossley, *re* appointment of, as Clerk Assistant to office of Routine and Records.. 240
Supplementary return *re* appointment of H. Crossley Sherwood.. .. .. 240*a*
Shareholders in Chartered Banks in Canada—List of, year ended December 31, 1915.. 6
Shell Inspectors employed in N. S. Steel Company, and at New Glasgow, N.S.. 157
Ships in British Columbia—*re* construction of, or assisting same by Government.. 204
Shovels—Reports *re* purchase of 25,000 special pattern by Dept. of Militia and Defence.. 275
Small Arms Ammunition:—
Documents *re* sale of, since August 4, 1914.. .. .. 276*a*
Documents *re* sale of, since August 4, 1914.. 276
Soldiers at North Sydney—*re* clothing, supplies, etc., furnished to.. 237
Soulanges Canal—List of employees on, in 1910; also list of employees on, in 1915. 158
Spirituous Liquors:—
Information *re*, in Great Britain, France, Italy, Belgium, Servia, Canada, Australia, New Zealand, and South Africa.. 255
Amounts paid under retroactive clause between date of such Act and beginning of war.. 288

S

Steamboat Inspection Report.. 23
Storage Elevator at Calgary, *re* location of.. 297
Starling, vessel—*re* chartering of, by Department of Marine and Fisheries.. .. 202
Statistical Branch, Department of Labour—Synopsis of exhibit by, *re* Cost of Labour.. .. .. 84*a*
Stellarton and New Glasgow—Investigation *re* weighing of freight at, on I.C.R., 1914-15.. 136
Steam Trawlers—Tonnage, etc., of all clearing from Canso, N.S., in year 1915. 263
Stoddart, P. A., Fishery Guardian, Shelburne Co., N.S., *re* payments made to.. 201
Strubel, Frank—*re* Homestead of, entered at Land Office at Weyburn and Estevan.. 83
Stream Measurements—Report of progress of, for year 1915.. .. .. 25*c*
Superannuation and Retiring Allowances, year ending December 31, 1915.. 57
St. Eleuthière Station—Relating to changing of, on N. T. Railway.. 226
St. Nicholas Quarry—Documents *re* purchase of.. 272

T

Telegraph lines and location of, erected in Co. of Inverness, N.S.. 100
Telegraph Statistics, year 1915 .. .. .. 20*f*
Temporary Loans—Statement of, to December 31, 1915.. 62
Théberge, J. S.—Investigation *re* loss of horse by, on Intercolonial Railway, 1911 to 1913.. 130
Thetford Mines—Correspondence between Department of Labour and workingmen at, *re* strike.. 148
Topographical Surveys Branch—Report of year 1914-15.. .. .. 25*b*
Trade Unions—Annual Return respecting 70
Transcontinental Railway:—
Report of Commisioners of year 1914.. 37
Fire protection on, etc.. 279
Transatlantic Mail Service—Relating to, for winter service, 1915-16.. 245
Treasury Board Over-ruling—Statement of.. 64
Trent Valley Waterways System—Documents *re* transfer of, by Government of Ontario to Government of Canada.. 296
Trousers, Breeches, etc.—Number, names, prices, etc., of firms or individuals manufacturing.. 92
Trade and Commerce:—
Report of Department of, for year ended March 31, 1915:—
Part I—Canadian Trade (Imports and Exports.. 10
Part II—Canadian Trade with (1) France, (2) Germany, (3) United Kingdom, (4) United States.. .. 10*a*
Part III—Canadian Trade with British and Foreign Countries (except France, Germany, United Kingdom and United States).. .. .. 10*b*
Part IV—Miscellaneous information. 10*c*
Part V—Report of the Grain Commissioners for Canada.. .. .. .. 10*d*
Part VI—Subsidized Steamship Services, etc.. .. .. 10*e*
Part VII—Trade of Foreign Countries, Treaties and Conventions.. 10*f*

U

Unclaimed Balances in Chartered Banks for five years prior to December 31, 1915.. 7
Unclaimed Balances in the Banks for patriotic purposes—Correspondence re. 159
Union Station at Quebec—Copy of agreement between Government for Transcontinental Ry., C.P.Ry. and C.N.Ry.. 290

V

Vale Railway, Co. of Pictou, N.S., re purchase, etc., of, by Railway Department. 209
Valley Railway re contracts between Government of Canada and Government of New Brunswick regarding operation of. 279
Vessels—List of, belonging to Government on service; also those not in service.. 273
Veterinary Director General—Report of, for year 1916.. .. .. 15b

W

War supplies, re application of Industrial Disputes Act re delivery of.. .. 238
Waterworks and Sewerage Systems of Canada—Report of Conservation Commission on.. 286
Wheat—Quantity of, shipped years 1914, 1915, from Winnipeg to Port Arthur, Fort William, Duluth, etc.. 264
Wharfage on goods landed on Government wharves in Co. of Victoria, N.S... 206
Wharf at Shag Harbour, N.S.—Documents relating to repairs to, in years 1915-1916.. 137
Wharf at Rivière Ouelle, names, occupations of persons employed at, in 1915.. 165
Wharf or blocking at head of Belleville, Yarmouth Co., N.S., expenditure on.. 167
Wharf at Shad Bay, N.S., re construction of at, in 1914-15.. 218
Wilson, J. W. V., expenses of, as Fishery Guardian in Shelburne, N.S., 1915.. 161
Wireless Operator—Rank of, in Royal Naval Canadian Volunteer Reserve .. 73
Women's Purity Federation at San Francisco—Report of delegates attending.. 85
Wrecks on St. Lawrence River—Statement of, from 1867 to 1916.. 181

Y

Yukon Territory—Orders in Council re government of.. 53

See also Alphabetical List, Page 1.

LIST OF SESSIONAL PAPERS

Arranged in Numerical Order, with their titles at full length; the dates when Ordered and when presented to the House of Parliament; the name of the Senator or Member who moved for each Sessional Paper, and whether it is ordered to be Printed or Not Printed.

CONTENTS OF VOLUME E.

Fifth Census of Canada, 1911—Volume V—Forest, Fishery, Fur and Mineral Production.
Fifth Census of Canada, 1911—Volume VI—Occupations of the people.

CONTENTS OF VOLUME 1.

(This volume is bound in three parts.)

1. Report of the Auditor General for the year ended 31st March, 1915, Volume 1, Parts a b and A to L; Volume III, Parts V to Z. Presented by Sir Thomas White, February 7 1916.
Printed for distribution and sessional papers.

1. Report of the Auditor General for the year ended 31st March, 1915, Volume II, Parts M to U. Presented by Sir Thomas White, February 10, 1916.
Printed for distribution and sessional papers.

1. Report of the Auditor General for the year ended 31st March, 1915, Volume IV, part ZZ. Presented by Sir Thomas White, February 14, 1916.
Printed for distribution and sessional papers.

CONTENTS OF VOLUME 2.

2. The Public Accounts of Canada for the fiscal year ending March 31, 1915. Presented by Sir Thomas White, February 1, 1916.. ..*Printed for distribution and sessional papers.*

3. Estimates of sums required for the service of the Dominion for the year ending March 31, 1917. Presented by Sir Thomas White, 1916.
Printed for distribution and sessional papers.

4. Supplementary Estimates of sums required for the service of the Dominion for the year ending March 31, 1916. Presented by Sir Thomas White, 1916.
Printed for distribution and sessional papers.

5. Supplementary Estimates of sums required for the service of the Dominion for the year ending March 31, 1917. Presented by Sir Thomas White, 1916.
Printed for distribution and sessional papers.

5*a*. Further Supplementary Estimates for the service of the Dominion for the year ending March 31, 1917. Presented by Sir Thomas White, 1916.
Printed for distribution and sessional papers.

5*b*. Further Supplementary Estimates for the fiscal year ending March 31, 1917. Presented by Sir Thomas White, May 1916.. .. .. ..*Printed for distribution and sessional papers.*

CONTENTS OF VOLUME 3.

6. List of Shareholders in the Chartered Banks of the Dominion of Canada as on December 31, 1915. Presented by Sir Thomas White, February 1, 1916.
Printed for distribution and sessional papers.

CONTENTS OF VOLUME 4.

7. Report on certified cheques, drafts or bills of exchange, dividends, remaining unpaid and unclaimed balances in Chartered Banks of the Dominion of Canada, for five years and upwards prior to December 31, 1915. Presented by Sir Thomas White, February 1, 1916. *Printed for distribution and sessional papers.*

CONTENTS OF VOLUME 5.

(This volume is bound in two parts.)

8. Report of the Superintendent of Insurance for the year 1915. Presented by Sir Thomas White, 1916.. .. ..*Printed for distribution and sessional papers.*

9. Abstract of Statements of Insurance Companies in Canada for the year ended December 31 1915. Presented by Sir Thomas White, April 10, 1916. *Printed for distribution and sessional papers.*

CONTENTS OF VOLUME 6.

10. Report of the Department of Trade and Commerce for the fiscal year ended March 31, 1915: Part I.—Canadian Trade (Imports in and Exports from Canada). Presented by Sir George Foster, January 13, 1916.. ..*Printed for distribution and sessional papers.*

CONTENTS OF VOLUME 7.

10*a*. Report of the Department of Trade and Commerce for the fiscal year ended March 31, 1915: Part II.—Canadian Trade with (1) France, (2) Germany, (3) United Kingdom, (4) United States. Presented by Sir George Foster, 1916. *Printed for distribution and sessional papers.*

10*b*. Report of the Department of Trade and Commerce for the fiscal year ended March 31, 1915: Part III.—Canadian Trade with foreign countries (except France, Germany, the United Kingdom and United States). Presented by Sir George Foster, 1916. *Printed for distribution and sessional papers.*

10*c*. Report of the Department of Trade and Commerce for the fiscal year ended March 31, 1916: (Part IV.—Miscellaneous Information.) Presented by Sir George Foster, 1916. *Printed for distribution and sessional papers.*

10*d*. Report of the Grain Commissioners for Canada. (Part V.) Presented by Sir George Foster, 1916.. .. ..*Printed for distribution and sessional papers.*

CONTENTS OF VOLUME 8.

10*e*. Report of the Department of Trade and Commerce for the fiscal year ended March 31, 1915: Part VI.—Subsidized Steamship Services, with statistics showing steamship traffic to December 31, 1915, and Estimates for the fiscal year 1916-17. Presented by Sir George Foster, 1916.. .. ..*Printed for distribution and sessional papers.*

10*f*. Report of Trade and Commerce for the fiscal year ended March 31, 1915: Part VII.—Trade of Foreign Countries, Treaties and Conventions. Presented by Sir George Foster, 1916. *Printed for distribution and sessional papers.*

CONTENTS OF VOLUME 9.

11. Report of the Department of Customs for the year ended March 31, 1915. Presented by Hon. Mr. Reid, January 18, 1916.. .. ..*Printed for distribution and sessional papers.*

CONTENTS OF VOLUME 10.

12, 13, 14. Reports, Returns and Statistics of the Inland Revenue of the Dominion of Canada, for the year ended March 31, 1915. Part I.—Excise. Part II.—Inspection of Weights and Measures, Gas and Electricity. Part III.—Adulteration of Food. Presented by Hon. Mr. Patenaude, February 18, 1916..*Printed for distribution and sessional papers.*

CONTENTS OF VOLUME 11.

15. Report of the Minister of Agriculture for the Dominion of Canada, for the year ended March 31, 1915. Presented by Hon. Mr. Burrell, January 20, 1916.
Printed for distribution and sessional papers.

15*a*. Report of the Dairy and Cold Storage Commissioner for the fiscal year ending March 31, 1915. (Dairying, Fruit, Extension of Markets and Cold Storage.) Presented by Hon. Mr. Burrell, February 1, 1916.. .. .. ..*Printed for distribution and sessional papers.*

15*b*. Report of the Veterinary Director General for the year ending March 31, 1915. Presented by Hon. Mr. Burrell, 1916.. .. ..*Printed for distribution and sessional papers.*

15*c*. Report on "The Agricultural Instruction Act," 1914-15, pursuant to Section 8, Chapter 5 of 3-4 George V. Presented by Hon. Mr. Burrell January 24, 1916.
Printed for distribution and sessional papers.

CONTENTS OF VOLUME 12

16. Report of the Director and Officers of the Experimental Farms for the year ending March 31, 1915. Presented by Hon. Mr. Burrell, January 31, 1916.
Printed for distribution and sessional papers.

CONTENTS OF VOLUME 13.

17. Criminal Statistics for the year ended September 30, 1914. (Appendix to the Report of the Minister of Trade and Commerce for the year 1914.) Presented by Sir George Foster, 1916.. .. ..*Printed for distribution and sessional papers.*

18. Return of By-elections for the House of Commons of Canada held during the year 1915. Presented by Hon. Mr. Speaker, 1916.. ..*Printed for distribution and sessional papers.*

CONTENTS OF VOLUME 14.

(This volume is bound in two parts.)

19. Report of the Minister of Public Works on the works under his control for the fiscal year ended March 31, 1915. Presented by Hon. Mr. Rogers, January 13, 1916.
Printed for distribution and sessional papers.

19*a*. Ottawa River Storage for year 1915.. .. ..*Printed for distribution and sessional papers.*

19*b*. Interim Report of the Commission appointed to examine into certain general conditions of Transportation bearing on the economic problem of the proposed Georgian Bay Canal. Presented by Hon. Mr. Rogers, April 14, 1916.
Printed for distribution and sessional papers.

CONTENTS OF VOLUME 15.

20. Annual Report of the Department of Railways and Canals, for the fiscal year from April 1, 1914, to March 31, 1915. Presented by Hon. Mr. Cochrane, February 2, 1916.
Printed for distribution and sessional papers.

20*a*. Canal Statistics for the season of navigation, 1915. Presented by Hon. Mr. Reid, May 17, 1916.. .. ..*Printed for distribution and sessional papers.*

20*b*. Railway Statistics of the Dominion of Canada, for the year ended June 30, 1915. Presented by Hon. Mr. Cochrane, April 4, 1916.. ..*Printed for distribution and sessional papers.*

CONTENTS OF VOLUME 16.

20*c*. Tenth Report of the Board of Railway Commissioners for Canada, for the year ending March 31, 1915. Presented by Hon. Mr. Cochrane, February 2, 1916.
Printed for distribution and sessional papers.

20*d*. Telephone Statistics of the Dominion of Canada, for the year ended June 30, 1915. Presented by Hon. Mr. Cochrane, April 13, 1915.
Printed for distribution and sessional papers.

20*e*. Express Statistics of the Dominion of Canada, for the year ended June 30, 1915. Presented by Hon. Mr. Cochrane, April 13, 1916.. ..*Printed for distribution and sessional papers.*

20*f*. Telegraph Statistics of the Dominion of Canada, for the year ended June 30, 1915. Presented by Hon. Mr. Cochrane, May 16, 1916.
Printed for distribution and sessional papers.

CONTENTS OF VOLUME 17.

21. Forty-eighth Annual Report of the Department of Marine and Fisheries, for the year 1914-1915.—Marine. Presented by Hon. Mr. Hazen, January 13, 1916.
Printed for distribution and sessional papers.

22. List of Shipping issued by the Department of Marine and Fisheries, being a list of vessels on the registry books of the Dominion of Canada on December 31, 1915. Presented by Hon. Mr. Hazen, 1916.. .. ..*Printed for distribution and sessional papers.*

23. Supplement to the Forty-eighth Annual Report of the Department of Marine and Fisheries for the fiscal year 1914-15. Marine.—Steamboat Inspection Report.
Printed for distribution and sessional papers.

CONTENTS OF VOLUME 18.

24. Report of the Postmaster General for the year ended March 31, 1915. Presented by Hon. Mr. Casgrain, January 13, 1916.. .. ....*Printed for distribution and sessional papers.*

CONTENTS OF VOLUME 19.

25. Annual Report of the Department of the Interior for the fiscal year ending March 31, 1915. Presented by Hon. Mr. Roche, January 13, 1916.
Printed for distribution and sessional papers.

25*b*. Annual Report of the Topographical Surveys Branch of the Department of the Interior, 1914-15. Presented by Hon. Mr. Roche, May 1, 1916.
Printed for distribution and sessional papers.

CONTENTS OF VOLUME 20.

25*c*. Report of progress of stream measurements for the calendar year 1915. Presented by Hon. Mr. Roche, 1916.. .. ..*Printed for distribution and sessional papers.*

25*d*. Fourteenth Report of the Geographic Board of Canada for year ended March 31, 1915.
Printed for distribution and sessional papers.

CONTENTS OF VOLUME 21.

25*e*. British Columbia Hydrographic Surveys .. ..*Printed for distribution and sessional papers.*

25*f*. Manitoba Hydrographic Surveys, 1912-14.. ..*Printed for distribution and sessional papers.*

25*g* Report of the Chief Medical Officer Department of the Interior, for 1915.
Printed for distribution and sessional papers.

CONTENTS OF VOLUME 22.

26. Summary Report of the Geological Survey Department of Mines, for the calendar year 1914. Presented by Hon. Mr. Roche, 1916.
Printed for distribution and sessional papers.

26*a*. Summary Report of the Mines Branch for the calendar year 1914. Presented by Hon. Mr. Roche, 1916.. .. ..*Printed for distribution and sessional papers.*

CONTENTS OF VOLUME 23.

27. Report of the Department of Indian Affairs for the year ended March 31, 1915. Presented by Hon. Mr. Roche, January 19, 1916..*Printed for distribution and sessional papers.*

28. Report of the Royal Northwest Mounted Police, 1915. Presented by Sir Robert Borden, January 19, 1916.. .. ..*Printed for distribution and sessional papers.*

CONTENTS OF VOLUME 24.

29. Report of the Secretary of State of Canada for the year ended March 31, 1915. Presented by Hon. Mr. Blondin, February 28, 1916.
Printed for distribution and sessional papers.

29*a*. Report of the work of the Public Archives for the year 1914. Presented, 1916.
Printed for distribution and sessional papers.

CONTENTS OF VOLUME 25.

30. The Civil Service List of Canada for 1915. Presented by Hon. Mr. Patenaude 1916.
Printed for distribution and sessional papers.

31. Annual Report of the Civil Service Commission of Canada for the year ended August 31, 1915. Presented by Hon. Mr. Patenaude, 1916.
Printed for distribution and sessional papers.

CONTENTS OF VOLUME 26.

32. Annual Report of the Department of Public Printing and Stationery for the fiscal year ended March 31, 1915. Presented by Hon. Mr. Blondin, March 20, 1916.
Printed for distribution and sessional papers.

33. Report of the Secretary of State for External Affairs for the year ended March 31, 1915. Presented by Sir Robert Borden, February 23, 1916.
Printed for distribution and sessional papers.

34. Report of the Minister of Justice as to Penitentiaries of Canada for the fiscal year ending March 31, 1915.. .. ..*Printed for distribution and sessional papers.*

35. Report of the Militia Council for the Dominion of Canada, for the fiscal year ending March 31, 1915. Presented by Sir Sam Hughes, February 21, 1916.
Printed for distribution and sessional papers.

35a. Employment for the Expeditionary Forces after the war. Presented, 1916.
Printed for distribution and sessional papers.

36. Report of the Department of Labour for the fiscal year ending March 31, 1915. Presented by Hon. Mr. Crothers, January 25, 1916.
Printed for distribution and sessional papers.

36a. Eighth Report of the Registrar of Boards of Conciliation and Investigations of the proceedings under "The Industrial Disputes Investigation Act, 1907," for the fiscal year ending March 31, 1915. Presented by Hon. Mr. Crothers, January 25, 1916.
Printed for distribution and sessional papers.

CONTENTS OF VOLUME 27.

37. Eleventh Annual Report of the Commissioners of the Transcontinental Railway, for the year ended March 31, 1914. Presented by Hon. Mr. Cochrane, February 2, 1916.
Printed for distribution and sessional papers.

38. Report of the Department of the Naval Service, for the fiscal year ending March 31, 1915. Presented by Hon. Mr. Hazen, January 13, 1916.
Printed for distribution and sessional papers.

38a. Supplement to the Report of the Naval Service—Contributions to Canadian Biology, 1914-15. Presented by Hon. Mr. Hazen, 1916.
Printed for distribution and sessional papers.

38b. Natural History of the Herring. Presented, 1916.
Printed for distribution and sessional papers.

39. Forty-eighth Annual Report of the Fisheries Branch of the Department of the Naval Service, 1914-1915. Presented by Hon. Mr. Hazen, January 13, 1916.
Printed for distribution and sessional papers.

40. The Report of the Joint Librarians of Parliament. Presented by Hon. Mr. Speaker, January 13, 1916.. .. ..*Not printed.*

CONTENTS OF VOLUME 28.

41. Copies of Orders in Council authorizing Regulations for the Department of Naval Service in accordance with Section 47, Chapter 43, 9-10 Edward VII, as follows:—

P.C. 2864, dated the 4th December, 1915, Payment of Separation Allowance in the case of Warrant Officers.

P.C. 3009, dated 21st December, 1915, with reference to application of the Naval Discipline Act, etc., for the Government of the Naval Volunteer Force.

P.C. 63/422, dated 15th October, 1915, with reference to appointment of Assistant Paymasters in charge.

P.C. 2267, dated 25th September, 1915, with reference to regulations for payment of "Detained Pay."

P.C. 93/2151, dated 17th September, 1915, with reference to allowances to officers and men employed on coding and decoding duties, etc.

P.C. 1712, dated 21st July, 1915, with reference to scheme of pensions for officers and men of the Royal Canadian Forces, etc.

CONTENTS OF VOLUME 28—*Continued.*

P.C. 748, dated 13th April, 1915, with reference to institution of the ratings of rangetaker first and second class in the Royal Canadian Navy.

P.C. 58/1470, dated 24th June, 1915, with reference to increase in amount of Separation Allowance to a motherless child from 3s. to 5s.

P.C. 85/1158, dated 20th May, 1915, with reference to revision of amounts payable on account of Separation Allowance to dependents of Royal Canadian Naval Permanent Ratings.

P.C. 756, dated 13th April, 1915, with reference to payment of Allowances to officers of the Royal Naval Canadian Volunteer Reserve for performance of duties which carry with them an Allowance to officers of the Royal Canadian Navy. Presented by Hon. Mr. Hazen, January 17, 1916.. .. ..*Not printed.*

42. Copies of Proclamations, Orders in Council and Documents relating to the European War. Presented by Sir Robert Borden, January 18, 1916.. .. ..*Not printed.*

42a. First Supplement to Copies of Proclamations, Orders in Council and Documents relating to the European War. Presented by Sir Robert Borden, January 18, 1916..*Not printed.*

43. Orders in Council relating to the European War, from 29th April, 1915, to 12th January, 1916, both inclusive. Presented by Sir Robert Borden, January 18, 1916..*Not printed.*

44. Copy of New Rules of Court passed by the Judges of the Supreme Court of Alberta, under the authority of Section 576 of the Criminal Code, at meeting of 27th November, 1915. Presented by Hon. Mr. Meighen, January 20, 1916.. .. ..*Not printed.*

45. Account of the average number of men employed on the Dominion Police Force during each month of the year 1915, and of their pay and travelling expenses, pursuant to Chapter 92, Section 6, Subsection 2, of the Revised Statutes of Canada. Presented by Hon. Mr. Doherty, January 20, 1916.. .. ..*Not printed.*

46. Regulations under "The Destructive Insect and Pest Act," pursuant to Section 9, Chapter 31 of 9-10 Edward VII. Presented by Hon. Mr. Burrell, January 24, 1916..*Not printed.*

47. Return of Orders in Council which have been published in the *Canada Gazette* and in the British Columbia *Gazette*, between 12th January, 1915, and the 31st December, 1915, in accordance with provisions of Subsection *(d)* of Section 38 of the regulations for the survey, administration, disposal and management of Dominion Lands within the 40-mile Railway Belt in the Province of British Columbia. Presented by Hon. Mr. Roche, January 25, 1916.. .. ..*Not printed.*

48. Return of Orders in Council which have been published in the *Canada Gazette*, between 12th January, 1915, and the 31st December, 1915, in accordance with the provisions of Section 77 of "The Dominion Lands Act," Chapter 20 of the Statutes of Canada, 1908. Presented by Hon. Mr. Roche, January 25, 1916.. .. ..*Not printed.*

49. Return of Orders in Council which have been published in the *Canada Gazette*, between the 16th January, 1915, and the 31st December, 1915, in accordance with the provisions of "The Forest Reserves and Park Act," Section 19 of Chapter 10, 1-2 George V. Presented by Hon. Mr. Roche, January 25, 1916.. .. ..*Not printed.*

50. Return of Orders in Council which have been published in the *Canada Gazette*, between the 12th January, 1915, and the 31st December, 1915, in accordance with the provisions of Section 5 of "The Dominion Lands Survey Act," Chapter 21, 7-8 Edward VII. Presented by Hon. Mr. Roche, January 25, 1916.. .. ..*Not printed.*

51. Return of Orders in Council which have been published in the *Canada Gazette*, between the 12th January, 1915, and the 31st December, 1915, in accordance with the provisions of Chapter 47, 2 George V, entitled "The Railway Belt Water Act." Presented by Hon. Mr. Roche, January 25, 1916.. .. ..*Not printed.*

52. Return of Orders in Council passed between the 16th January, 1915, and the 31st December, 1915, approving of regulations and forms prescribed in accordance with the provisions of Section 57 of the Irrigation Act, Chapter 61, Revised Statutes of Canada, 1906, as amended by Chapter 38, 7-8 Edward VII. Presented by Hon. Mr. Roche, January 25, 1916.. .. ..*Not printed.*

53. Return of Orders in Council passed under the provisions of Section 18 of Chapter 63, Revised Statutes of Canada, "An Act to provide for the Government of the Yukon Territory." Presented by Hon. Mr. Roche, January 25, 1916.. .. ..*Not printed.*

54. Return showing lands sold by the Canadian Pacific Railway Company during the year which ended on the 30th September, 1915. Presented January 25, 1916...*Not printed.*

CONTENTS OF VOLUME 28—*Continued.*

55. Return called for by Section 88 of Chapter 62, Revised Statutes of Canada, requiring that the Minister of the Interior shall lay before Parliament, each year, a return of liquor brought from any place out of Canada into the Territories by special permission in writing of the Commissioner of the Northwest Territories. Presented by Hon. Mr. Roche, January 25, 1916.. .. .. .

CONTENTS OF VOLUME 28—*Continued.*

72. Certified copy of a report of the Committee of the Privy Council, approved by His Royal Highness the Governor General on the 7th February, 1916, appointing Robert A. Pringle, of the city of Ottawa, one of His Majesty's counsel learned in the law, and His Honour D. B. MacTavish, Judge of the County Court for the County of Carleton, a Commission, under the Inquiries Act, to conduct an inquiry into and concerning the origin of the recent disastrous fire which destroyed the Parliament Buildings at Ottawa. Presented by Sir Robert Borden, February 7, 1916.. .. ..*Not printed.*

72a. Report of the Royal Commission appointed to inquire into the origin of the fire which destroyed the Central Parliament Building at Ottawa, on Thursday, 3rd February, 1916. Also copy of evidence taken before the Royal Commission appointed to inquire into the origin of the fire which destroyed the Central Parliament Building at Ottawa, on Thursday, 3rd February, 1916. Presented by Hon. Mr. Rogers, May 16, 1915.
Printed for sessional papers only.

73. Copy of Order in Council, No. P.C. 162, dated 29th January, 1916,—Establishment of the rank of wireless operator in the Royal Naval Canadian Volunteer Reserve and regulations for the proper government thereof. Presented by Hon. Mr. Hazen, February 7, 1916.. .. ..*Not printed.*

74. Copy of Orders in Council, No. P.C. 183, dated 31st January, 1916,—Regulations governing the payment of allowance to officers of the Royal Canadian Naval Service acting as interpreters. Presented by Hon. Mr. Hazen, February 7, 1916.. .. ..*Not printed.*

74a. Copy of Order in Council No. P.C. 54/601, dated 16th March, 1916, authorizing payment of messing allowance to Royal Naval Reserve Officers. Presented by Hon. Mr. Hazen, March 29, 1916.. .. ..*Not printed.*

75. Communication from the Acting High Commissioner for Canada in London, Sir George Perley, enclosing a report on the Canadian Hospital at Dinard by Dr. Rallier du Baty, Chief Surgeon at the said hospital. Presented by Sir Robert Borden, February 7, 1916.
Printed for sessional papers only.

76. A communication from the Right Honourable A. Bonar Law, Colonial Secretary, to His Royal Highness the Governor General, enclosing a copy of the Imperial Parliamentary Debates (House of Commons, 10th January) on a resolution which was adopted by that House, as follows:—"That with a view to increasing the power of the Allies in the prosecution of the war, His Majesty's Government should enter into immediate consultation with the Governments of the Dominions in order with their aid to bring the whole economic strength of the Empire into co-operation with our Allies in a policy directed against the enemy." Presented by Sir Robert Borden, February 7, 1916.
Printed for distribution and sessional papers.

77. Correspondence between the Canadian Manufacturers' Association and the Prime Minister, 1914-1915. Presented by Sir Robert Borden, February 7, 1916.. .. ..*Not printed.*

78. Correspondence between the International Nickel Company and the Prime Minister. Presented by Sir Robert Borden, February 7, 1916.. .. ..*Not printed.*

79. Return to an Order of the House of the 7th February, 1916, for a copy of all correspondence and reports on the claims of Sealers of British Columbia under the last treaty with the American Republic. Presented February 9, 1916.
Printed for sessional papers only.

80. Certified copy of a report of the Committee of the Privy Council, approved by His Royal Highness the Governor General on the 15th April, 1915, giving authority for the renewal, from the 31st March, 1916, of the agreement between the Dominion Government and the Province of Alberta for the service of the Royal Northwest Mounted Police in that province. Presented by Sir Robert Borden, February 10, 1916.
Printed for sessional papers only.

81. Certified copy of a report of the Committee of the Privy Council, approved by His Royal Highness the Governor General on the 21st May, 1915, giving authority for the renewal, from the 31st March, 1916, of the agreement between the Dominion Government and the province of Saskatchewan, for the services of the Royal Northwest Mounted Police in that province. Presented by Sir Robert Borden, February 10, 1916.
Printed for sessional papers only.

82. Return to an Order of the House of the 8th February, 1916, for a copy of all letters, papers, and other documents relating to the application of Wasyl Pinianski for the patent of the southwest quarter section 5, township 25, range 4, west second principal meridian, Office File No. 1752484. Presented February 16, 1916.—*Mr. MacNutt*... ..*Not printed.*

CONTENTS OF VOLUME 28—*Continued.*

83. Return to an Order of the House of the 3rd February, 1916, for a copy of all affidavits, letters, telegrams and other correspondence during the years 1914 and 1915 in reference to the S.E. 7-1-13 west 2nd meridian, now the 160-acre homestead of Frank Strubell, between the Department of the Interior or the Minister, or any officer of the Department and the Land Office at Weyburn and Estevan, and with all parties who endeavoured to secure or assisted in securing homestead entry for the said land. Presented February 16, 1916.—*Mr. Turriff*.. .. ..*Not printed.*

84. Report of the Board of Inquiry appointed to make an investigation into the increase in the cost of living in Canada and the causes which have occasioned or contributed to such result. Presented by February 16, 1916.. .. .. ..*Printed for distribution.*

84a. Synopsis of exhibit by the Statistical Branch, Department of Labour, laid before the Board of Inquiry into the Cost of Living, 1915. Presented by Sir Robert Borden, February 29, 1916.. .. ..*Printed for distribution.*

85. Report of delegation representing the Government of Canada at the Ninth Annual Congress held under the auspices of the World's Purity Federation at San Francisco, July 18-24, 1915. Presented by Sir Robert Borden, February 16, 1916.. .. ..*Not printed.*

86. Return to an Address to His Royal Highness the Governor General, of the 7th February, 1916, for a copy of all Orders in Council, letters and correspondence which led to the convening of the conference of local governments which took place in Ottawa during the month of October last; together with all the proceedings and resolutions of the said conference. Presented February 17, 1916.—*Sir Wilfrid Laurier*.. .. .. ..*Not printed.*

87. Return to an Order of the House of the 3rd February, 1916, for a copy of all letters, telegrams and other documents relating to the purchase by the Government of the several parcels of land now comprised in the Experimental Farm at Rosthern, Saskatchewan. Presented February 22, 1916.—*Mr. McCraney*.. .. ..*Not printed.*

88. Return to an Order of the House, of the 7th February, 1916, for a return showing the names and post office addresses of all applicants for bounty under the Deep Sea Fisheries Act, from the districts of Ecum Secum, Marie Joseph, Spanish Ship Bay, and Liscombe, county of Guysborough, N.S., for the years 1912, 1913, 1914 and 1915, distinguishing between applications that have been accepted and the bounty paid, and those that have been rejected, and also the reasons for such rejections, if any. Presented February 22, 1916.—*Mr. Sinclair*.. .. ..*Not printed.*

89. Return to an Order of the House of the 3rd February, 1916, for a return showing the fractional areas of homestead lands, or otherwise, in the province of Saskatchewan, sold in the year 1915, the name of the purchaser, and the price paid in each case. Presented February 22, 1916.—*Mr. Martin (Regina)*.. .. ..*Not printed.*

90. Return to an Order of the House, of the 7th February, 1916, for a return showing a copy of the prospectus, rates of interest, the effective interest, the net yield, commission charges, printing charges and other charges, in connection with the Government Domestic Loan of one hundred million dollars, and also in connection with the loan of forty-five million dollars made at New York in 1915. Presented February 22, 1916.—*Mr. Maclean (Halifax)*.. .. ..*Not printed*

91. Return to an Order of the House of the 7th February, 1916, for a return showing the number of subscribers in the Government Domestic Loan of one hundred million dollars which were in the sum of $1,000 or under, and the number of other subscriptions in multiples of $1,000. Presented February 22, 1916.—*Mr. Maclean (Halifax)*.
Not printed.

92. Return to an Order of the House of the 8th March, 1915, for a return showing:—1. From how many firms or private individuals the Government, or any Department of the Government, has ordered trousers, breeches, and pantaloons since the 1st of July, 1914? 2. The names of these firms? 3. How many trousers, breeches and pantaloons have been ordered from each firm? 4. How many each firm has delivered up to date? 5. How many each firm has yet to deliver? 6. The price each firm is receiving for these trousers, breeches and pantaloons. Presented February 24, 1916.—*Mr. Chisholm (Inverness)* .. ..*Not printed.*

93. Return to an Order of the House of the 8th March, 1915, for a return showing the number of appointments to the Inside Service and to the Outside Service since October, 1911, of persons resident in the county of Wright, the number of dismissals from the service since October, 1911; the number of resignations from the service since above date; with the names of parties at whose request such resignations, if any, were tendered. Presented February 24, 1916.—*Mr. Devlin*.. .. ..*Not printed.*

CONTENTS OF VOLUME 28—*Continued.*

94. Return to an Order of the House of the 8th April, 1915, for a return showing:—1. The names of the persons who have successfully passed the Civil Service examination in the province of Quebec since the establishment of the Civil Service Commission. 2. The number of such persons who have been called upon to enter the Civil Service. 3. The number in each grade of those who have pased such examinations with success. Presented February 24, 1916.—*Mr. Boulay*.. .. ..*Not printed.*

95. Return to an Order of the House of the 3rd February, 1916, for a copy of all documents, papers and telegrams in any way referring to the application of Aenas McKinnon, of Iron Mines, Inverness County, for the Fenian Raid Veteran Bounty. Presented February 24, 1916.—*Mr. Chisholm (Inverness)*.. .. ..*Not printed.*

95*a*. Return to an Order of the House of the 14th February, 1916, for a copy of all telegrams, letters, petitions and documents of any kind, referring in any way to the application of Anes or Angus McKinnon, of Iron Mines or Orangedale, Inverness County, for the Fenian Raid Bounty. Presented March 3, 1916.—*Mr. Chisholm (Inverness)*.
Not printed.

96. Return to an Order of the House of the 15th March, 1915, for a copy of the claim of Captain Stephen Paul, owner of the steamer *Rhoda*, for the destruction of his ship, as a wreckage, by the Department of Marine, and of all correspondence with regard to the same. Presented February 24, 1916.—*Sir Wilfrid Laurier*.. .. ..*Not printed.*

97. Return to an Order of the House of the 29th March, 1915, for a copy of all letters and telegrams, or any other written communications which passed between the Minister of Railways and Canals and J. C. Douglas, Esq., M.P.P., of Glace Bay, Nova Scotia, between the 1st of January and the last of December, 1914, and of all letters and telegrams between the Minister of Customs and Public Works, and the Postmaster General, and the said J. C. Douglas during the above period, in respect to the dismissal, appointment or restoration to office of Government officials. Presented February 24, 1916.—*Mr. McKenzie*.. .. ..*Not printed.*

98. Return to an Order of the House of the 3rd February, 1916, for a copy of all reports upon the depths of water in the different locks in the East River of Pictou, improvements, and of all correspondence and recommendations in regard to changes on the plans therefor. Presented February 24, 1916.—*Mr. Macdonald*.. .. ..*Not printed.*

98*a*. Supplementary return to an Order of the House of the 3rd February, 1916, for a copy of all reports upon the depths of water in the different locks in the East River of Pictou, improvements, and of all correspondence and recommendations in regard to changes on the plans therefor. Presented March 13, 1916.—*Mr. Macdonald*.. .. ..*Not printed.*

99. Return to an Order of the House of the 3rd February, 1916, for a copy of all letters, telegrams, petitions and other papers relative to the granting of a Conciliation Board to the employees of the Acadia Coal Company, in the county of Pictou, in the autumn of 1915. Presented February 24, 1916.—*Mr. Macdonald*.. .. ..*Not printed.*

100. Return to an Order of the House of the 1st March, 1915, for a return showing the number of miles of telegraph lines, and the locations, erected in the county of Inverness, each year since 1896, to the present day, with the cost of each line. Presented February 24, 1916.—*Mr. Chisholm (Inverness)*.. .. ..*Not printed.*

101. Return to an Order of the House of the 3rd February, 1916, for a copy of all tenders, letters, telegrams and contracts relative to a mail contract from Noel to Maitland, in the county of Hants, and relative to the warding of the same under contract. Presented February 24, 1916.—*Mr. Macdonald*.. .. ..*Not printed.*

102. Return to an Order of the House of the 22nd March, 1915, for a copy of the petition addressed to the Post Office Department for the establishment of the rural mail delivery route in the county of Shefford, known as Warden No. 1, and of all letters, telegrams reports and other communications connected therewith. Presented February 24, 1916.—*Mr. Boivin*.. .. ..*Not printed.*

103. Return to an Order of the House of the 9th February, 1916, for a return showing the different rural mail routes in the Strathcona constituency, their location and date of establishment, and all rural routes under consideration at the present time. Presented February 24, 1916.—*Mr. Douglas*.. .. ..*Not printed.*

103*a*. Return to an Order of the House of the 16th February, 1916, for a return showing the location of all rural mail routes in the present constituency of Strathcona, the date of their inception, and the location of routes at present under consideration. Presented February 24, 1916.—*Mr. Douglas*.. .. ..*Not printed.*

104. Return to an Order of the House of the 25th March, 1915, for a copy of all letters, papers, petitions, reports and other documents relating to the establishment of a rural mail delivery route, for the purpose of giving postal service to the districts of Hodson and Toney Mills, county of Pictou. Presented February 24, 1916.—*Mr. Macdonald.*
Not printed.

CONTENTS OF VOLUME 28—*Continued.*

105. Return to an Order of the House of the 3rd February, 1916, for a copy of all correspondence, letters, telegrams and memorials received by the Honourable Postmaster General or the Right Hon. Sir Robert L. Borden, since January 1, 1912, relating to the contract for carrying the mail across Lemon Ferry, in the county of Richmond, N.S., and also of all replies thereto. Presented February 24, 1916.—*Mr. Kyte*.. .. ..*Not printed.*

106. Return to an Order of the House of the 7th February, 1916, for a return showing how many rural mail delivery routes have been opened during the last fiscal year, in what counties, and at what cost in each county. Presented February 24, 1916.—*Mr. Lemieux.* *Not printed.*

107. Return to an Order of the House of the 7th February, 1916, for a copy of all correspondence between the Department of Marine and Fisheries, or any department of Government, and the Pilot Commissioners of the harbour and district of St. Anns, in the county of Victoria, during the years 1914 and 1915, in respect to the removal or dismissal of Daniel Buchanan from the office of pilot of said harbour or district. Presented February 24, 1916.—*Mr. McKenzie*.. .. ..

CONTENTS OF VOLUME 28—*Continued.*

117. Return to an address to His Royal Highness the Governor General of the 7th February, 1916, for a copy of all evidence, reports, memoranda or Orders in Council, relative to the retirement or dismissal from the customs service at the Port of Halifax, of A. J. Crosby, Thomas Lynch and J. B. Naylor. Presented February 25, 1916.—*Mr. Maclean (Halifax)* .. .. ..

CONTENTS OF VOLUME 28—*Continued.*

131. Return to an Order of the House of the 7th February, 1916, for a copy of all letters, telegrams, evidence of witnesses at the investigation, and reports thereon, in relation to the claim of Alexandre D. Doucet, of Beresford, N.B., for cattle killed on the Intercolonial Railroad on May 25, 1915. Presented March 1, 1916.—*Mr. Turgeon.*
Not printed.

132. Return to an Order of the House of the 3rd February, 1916, for a copy of all letters, telegrams, correspondence and agreements between the Department of Railways and Canals, and any official thereof, including the officials of the Intercolonial Railway, regarding the installation of the McQueen Siding, so-called, at Shediac, in the province of New Brunswick, and the subsequent removal thereof. Presented March 1, 1916.—*Mr. Carvell*.. .. .. .

CONTENTS OF VOLUME 28—*Continued.*

141. Return to an Order of the House of the 7th February, 1916, for a return of all sums of money expended, respectively, during the present fiscal year by the Department of Public Works, chargeable to capital account, for public buildings and harbours and rivers, by provinces, designating in detail the purposes of such expenditure. Presented March 1, 1916.—*Mr. Maclean (Halifax)*.. .. ..*Not printed.*

142. Return to an Order of the House of the 3rd February, 1916, for a copy of all letters, telegrams and other documents in connection with the purchase of a site for the post office building at Bear River, N.S. Presented March 1, 1916.—*Mr. Law*.. .. .. ..*Not printed.*

143. Return to an Order of the House of 7th February, 1916, for a copy of all letters, papers, telegrams, pay-sheets, pay-rolls, receipts and documents of all kinds whatsoever in connection with the extension or repairs on the public breakwater at Port Morien, in South Cape Breton, during 1915. Presented March 1, 1916.—*Mr. Carroll*.. .. ..*Not printed.*

144. Return to an Order of the House of 16th February, 1916, for a copy of all letters, telegrams and correspondence between the Department of Marine and Fisheries, or any official thereof, and any person or persons in reference to the proposed retirement from office of the present keeper of the lighthouse at Cape Jourmain, in the county of Westmorland. Presented March 1, 1916.—*Mr. Copp*.. .. ..*Not printed.*

145. Return to an Order of the House of 7th February, 1916, for a copy of all correspondence between the Department of Militia and Defence or any of its branches, and the Department of Agriculture, in reference to the using of the immigration or quarantine buildings at McNab's Island and Lawlor's Island, Halifax, N.S., for military purposes, and particularly for their use by the 63rd Regiment, Overseas Contingent. Presented March 1, 1916.—*Mr. Maclean (Halifax)*.. .. ..*Not printed.*

146. Return to an Order of the House of 7th February, 1916, for a return showing the names of all medical officers appointed and employed for immigration or quarantine purposes at Halfax, St. John, Quebec, Montreal, Toronto, Winnipeg, Regina, Calgary, Edmonton, Vancouver and Victoria, together with the date of appointment of each, their salary, and in each case designating whether they or any of them are still in the service of the Government, and when not, the date when the service ceased. Presented March 1, 1916. —*Mr. Maclean (Halifax)*.. .. ..*Not printed.*

147. Return to an Order of the House of the 3rd February, 1916, for a return showing:—1. The names of the different tenderers for the carrying of the mails from the rural boxes established in the counties of l'Assomption and Montcalm down to the present day. 2. The figure of each of such contracts, and the name of the tenderer to whom each of such contracts has been awarded, and for what sum. 3. If any contracts were given without tender. If so, to whom, and for what amount. Presented March 2, 1916 — *Mr. Seguin*.. .. ..*Not printed.*

148. Return to an Order of the House of the 21st February, 1916, for a copy of all correspondence and telegrams exchanged between the Labour Department and the workingmen at Thetford Mines prior, during, or after the last strike in that vicinity, and of all other papers relating thereto. Presented March 2, 1916.—*Mr. Verville*.. .. .. ..*Not printed.*

149. Fenian Raid Bounties—to whom paid in Queens County, N.S.—(*Senate*).. ..*Not printed.*

150. Return to an Address to His Royal Highness the Governor General, of the 3rd February, 1916, for a copy of all Orders in Council passed since 4th August, 1914, dealing with members of the Canadian Expeditionary Forces in the following particulars: Pensions to partially or totally disabled soldiers or their dependents; money allowances or other provision made for the support or care of partially or totally disabled returned soldiers; and pay allowances or other consideration to dependents of soldiers while on active service, and after their return from active service, because of disablement from any cause. Presented March 3, 1916.—*Mr. Oliver*.. .. ..*Printed for sessional papers only.*

151. Return to an Order of the House of the 3rd February, 1916, for a return showing the names of all medical officers employed and designated in the years 1914 and 1915, in the examination of recruits in the county of Pictou, and of any changes in the list of said officers in said period. Presented March 3, 1916.—*Mr. Macdonald*.. ..*Not printed.*

152. Return to an Order of the House of the 4th March, 1915, for a return showing the names and addresses of all persons in Annapolis and Digby Counties, Nova Scotia, to whom the bounty under the Fenian Raid Volunteer Bounty Act has been paid; the names and addresses of all persons from said counties whose applications have been rejected; and the names and addresses of all applicants from said counties whose applications have not been disposed of. Presented March 3, 1916.—*Mr. Law*.. .. ..*Not printed.*

153. Return to an Order of the House of the 19th February, 1915, for a return showing the names and addresses of all persons in South Cape Breton, Nova Scotia, who have been paid Fenian Raid Bounty; the names and addresses of all persons in South Cape Breton, N.S., who have made application for said bounty and who have not yet received it. Presented March 3, 1916.—*Mr. Carroll*.. .. ..*Not printed.*

CONTENTS OF VOLUME 28—*Continued.*

154. Return to an Order of the House of the 1st March, 1915, for a return showing the names and addresses of all persons who received bounty. Raid Bounty was paid in the county of Halifax, N.S., to date. Presented March 3, 1916.—*Mr. Maclean (Halifax).*
Not printed.

155. Return to an Order of the House of the 31st March, 1915, for a copy of all applications received for Fenian Raid Bounty from residents of the county of Hants, N.S.; also the names of persons who have been paid the bounty and those who have been refused it in said county; with the reasons for refusal, and showing the number of applications that have not yet been dealt with. Presented March 3, 1916.—*Mr. Chisholm (Inverness)*.. .. .. .

CONTENTS OF VOLUME 28—*Continued.*

168. Return to an Order of the House of the 16th February, 1916, for a copy of all letters, petitions, correspondence and telegrams, exchanged between the Government, its resident engineer of the district, and all other persons concerning the construction of a bridge between Ile Perrot and Ste. Ann de Bellevue, and Ile Perrot and Vaudreuil. Presented March 7, 1916.—*Mr. Boyer*.. .. ..*Not printed.*

169. Return to an Order of the House of the 21st February, 1916, for a copy of all letters and correspondence between A. Bellemare, Esq., M.P., and the Government, or any member thereof, in connection with the construction of the post office at Louiseville. Presented March 7, 1916.—*Mr. Gauvreau*.. .. ..*Not printed.*

170. Return to an Order of the House of the 21st February, 1916, for a return showing the amounts spent for the furnishing of the office of the Hon. E. Patenaude, Minister of Inland Revenue; with a copy of all invoices. And also a statement of the amounts spent for the furnishing of the office of the Hon. W. B. Nantel, when Minister of Inland Revenue; with a copy of all invoices. Presented March 7, 1916.—*Mr. Lanctot.*
Not printed.

171. Return to an Order of the House of the 3rd February, 1916, for a copy of all documents, title deeds, papers, notarial deeds or private writings in connection with the sale, donation or transfer, by the estate of Alex. Fraser, of Rivière du Loup, to the Government or the Railway Department, for the Intercolonial, the lot of land or part of the lot of land, at the east of the Intercolonial bridge at Rivière du Loup, at a place called Gauvreau Yard; also of all correspondence in this connection. Presented March 7, 1916.—*Mr. Gouvreau*.. .. ..*Not printed.*

172. Report of the Federal Plan Commission on a general plan for the cities of Ottawa and Hull, 1915. Presented by Sir Robert Borden, March 10, 1916.. .. ..*Not printed.*

173. Return to an Order of the House of the 3rd February, 1916, for copies of all telegrams, letters, petitions, correspondence and other documents whatsoever relating to the post office and the postmaster of the Parish of St. Esprit, in the county of Montcalm, from October, 1911, to the present day. Presented March 10, 1916.—*Mr. Seguin.*
Not printed.

174. Return to an Order of the House of the 16th February, 1916, for a copy of all telegrams, letters, petitions and documents of all kinds, in any way referring to the awarding of the contract for carrying the mail from Inverness to Margaree Harbour. Presented March 10, 1916.—*Mr. Chisholm (Inverness)*.. .. ..*Not printed.*

175. Return to an Order of the House of the 3rd February, 1916, for a copy of all letters, papers, telegrams and documents of all kinds whatsoever in connection with the tenders and awarding of the contract for carrying the mails between the tram cars and the post office at Glace Bay, South Cape Breton. Presented March 10, 1916.—*Mr. Carroll.*
Not printed.

176. Return to an Order of the House of the 7th February, 1916, for a copy of all papers, memoranda, correspondence, reports, etc., in connection with the dismissal of John E. Hallamore, as postmaster at Upper New Cornwall, Lunenburg County, N.S. Presented March 10, 1916.—*Mr. Maclean (Halifax)*.. .. ..*Not printed.*

177. Return to an Order of the House of the 16th February, 1916, for a copy of all telegrams, letters, petitions, and of all documents of all kinds in any way referring to the awarding of the contract for carrying the mail to Eastern Harbour and Pleasant Bay. Presented March 10, 1916.—*Mr. Chisholm (Inverness)*.. .. ..*Not printed.*

178. Return to an Order of the House of the 21st February, 1916, for a detailed statement of all war orders obtained by the Dominion Steel Corporation of Sydney, Nova Scotia. Presented March 10, 1916.—*Mr. Lemieux*.. .. ..*Not printed.*

179. Return to an Order of the House of the 21st February, 1916, for a copy of the war orders given to the Montreal Street Railway Company. Presented March 10, 1916.—*Mr. Fortier*.. .. ..

CONTENTS OF VOLUME 28—*Continued.*

183. Return to an Address to His Royal Highness the Governor General of the 7th February, 1916, for a copy of the Order in Council or departmental order dismissing Mr. Bayfield from the position of Superintendent of Dredging in British Columbia; and also a copy of the Order in Council or departmental order appointing J. L. Nelson in his place. Presented March 13, 1916.—*Mr. Pugsley*.. .. ..*Not printed.*

184. Return to an Order of the House of the 23rd February, 1916, for a copy of all reports and documents concerning the surveys made by the Federal Government during the autumn of 1914 of Lake Matapedia and the river of the same name down to the village of Amqui. Presented March 13, 1916.—*Mr. Lapointe (Kamouraska)*. ..*Not printed.*

185. Return to an Order of the House of the 13th March, 1916, a copy of the pension list in force in Canada for disabled soldiers and of all petitions, letters or other documents relating to the amendment or readjustment of the same. Presented March 14, 1916.—*Printed for distribution and sessional papers.*

186. Return to an Order of the House of the 16th February, 1916, for a copy of all letters, petitions, correspondence and telegrams between the Government, the engineers, and all other persons concerning the building of the post office at Rigaud; also of the amounts of money paid to divers persons for such building, furnishing, the land, the care of the grounds and other works. Presented March 15, 1916.—*Mr. Boyer*.. .. ..*Not printed.*

187. Return to an Order of the House of the 6th March, 1916, for a return showing the different rural mail routes in the constituency of Medicine Hat, with their location and date of establishment; and also all rural mail routes now being established or under consideration at the present time in the same constituency. Presented March 15, 1916.—*Mr. Buchanan*.. .. ..*Not printed.*

187*a*. Return to an Order of the House of the 20th March, 1916, for a return showing:—1. The reason for the delay in the establishment of the rural mail routes, reported under consideration, in the constituency of Medicine Hat. 2. When these routes were first applied for. 3. If the applications possessed the required number of signatures. 4. If tenders have been invited. If so, for what routes. 5. Why the lowest tenders were not accepted, and the routes established. 6. If any tenders are being invited for these routes. 7. If there is a likelihood of any of these routes being operated immediately. Presented March 27, 1916.—*Mr. Buchanan*.. .. ..*Not printed.*

188. Return to an Order of the House of the 21st February, 1916, for a copy of all letters, telegrams, investigations and reports relating to the dismissal of Joseph Fleming, conductor Intercolonial Railway, and in regard to his reinstatement. Presented March 16, 1916.—*Mr. Macdonald*.. .. ..*Not printed.*

189. Return to an Order of the House of the 18th March, 1915, for a copy of all petitions, telegrams, communications and other documents relating to the dismissal of Mr. Hubert Paquin, postmaster of St. Gilbert de Portneuf. Presented March 16, 1916.—*Mr. Delisle.* *Not printed.*

190. Return to an Order of the House of the 16th February, 1916, for a copy of all letters, petitions, correspondence and telegrams, exchanged between the Government, its Inquiry Commissioner, Mr. G. H. Bergeron, and all other persons, concerning the inquiry, the dismissal and replacing of the postmasters of the different post offices mentioned below; and of all correspondence relating to the appointments of the present postmasters who replace the former ones, who had been either dismissed or replaced for one reason or another:—St. Lazare Village, Vaudreuil Station, Pointe Fortune, Val des Eboulis, Mont Oscar, St. Justine de Newton, Ste. Marthe. Presented March 16, 1916.—*Mr. Boyer.* *Not printed*

191. Dismissal of Mr. Chisholm, Inspector of Indian Agencies, Saskatchewan.—(*Senate*). *Not printed.*

192. Return to an Order of the House of the 28th February, 1916, for a return showing:—1. The names, rank and military qualifications of the officers on the Headquarters Staff of the 1st, 2nd and 3rd Divisional Areas, including those on Staffs of Camps and Schools of Instruction, on October 1, 1915. 2. The names of those of the above who on that date had volunteered, taken the oath and been attested for overseas service. Presented March 20, 1916.—*Mr. Proulx*.. .. ..*Not printed.*

193. Return to an Order of the House of the 21st February, 1916, for a return showing:—1. How many persons have been employed by the Department of Militia since the beginning of the war in the examining, appraising or testing of materials, such as clothing, harness, etc., purchased for military purposes. 2. How many of such employees are practical trades people, experts, or otherwise experienced persons in the respective callings connected with the various materials as purchased. Presented March 20, 1916.—*Mr. Verville*.. .. ..*Not printed.*

CONTENTS OF VOLUME 28—*Continued.*

194. Return to an Order of the House of the 6th March, 1916, for a copy of all telegrams, letters, petitions and documents of all kinds referring in any way to the application of Mrs. Flora McIntyre, of River Dennis, Inverness County, N.S., for the Fenian Raid Veteran Bounty of her late husband, Angus McIntyre, late of River Dennis. Presented March 20, 1916.—*Mr. Chisholm (Inverness)*.. .. ..*Not printed.*

195. Return to an Order of the House of the 13th March, 1916, for a return showing:—1. The names, dates of appointment, post office addresses at time of appointment, and former occupations of the censors employed by the Militia Department at Louisburg and North Sydney, Nova Scotia. 2. The names of all the said censors who are also decoders, and the names and addresses of all who are employed in the censorship service at the above points. 3. The amount paid to each censor or decoder since the 4th of August, 1914, up to the 1st February, 1916, or to any party or person in connection with the censorship or decoding services at the above places. Presented March 20, 1916.—*Mr. McKenie.*
Not printed.

196. Return to an Order of the House of the 3rd February, 1916, for a copy of all letters, telegrams, agreements and all other papers relative to the creation of a Board of Conciliation, during the year 1915, under the Industrial Disputes Investigation Act in regard to the employees of the Nova Scotia Steel Company, in the county of Pictou. Presented March 20, 1916.—*Mr. Macdonald*.. .. ..*Not printed.*

197. Return to an Order of the House of the 6th March, 1916, for a list of the employees in the Dominion Police Force, with the salary of each of them. Presented March 20, 1916. —*Mr. Boulay*.. .. ..*Not printed.*

198. Return showing:—1. Whether the Government have taken cognizance of the following article published in the Montreal "Gazette" on November 1, 1915:—"Canadian Help Comes from Sale of Gift Flour. Foodstuffs not Needed by the English Poor were Bought for Belgian Relief.—Funds to Aid East Coast.—Hon. Walter Long Suggested to Canadian Government that $750,000 be Allotted, and Latter Agreed.—(Special cable from the "Gazette's" resident staff correspondent.)

"London, October 31,—'Canada's aid to the east coast towns of England, which are suffering through the war, is the subject of some misconception,' said Sir George Perley to-day. In a statement in the Commons, Hon. Walter Long said that the necessary funds for a Government scheme of help for hotel and lodging house keepers had been generously provided by the Canadian Government. This gave rise to the idea that the Dominion was taking a new step, but the fact is that no money is coming from Canada. Of the flour sent by Canada a year ago to relieve distress in England, very little was distributed, as poverty was in no way abnormal. Some 400,000 bags of this flour were transferred to the American committee for Belgian relief, which purchased them. The money paid for this flour being in the hands of the Local Government Board, Hon. Walter Long, as President of the Board, suggested to Sir George Perley that this might be utilized for the relief of the east coast towns where the season had been ruined owing to the lack of railway facilities and the disinclination of the public to visit the east coast because of the possibility of German naval or aerial raids. The Dominion Government acquiesced in this proposal, and the sum of $750,000, part of the proceeds of the sale of the flour, has now been allotted for this purpose. Canada's generosity will therefore go to alleviate the distress of a large number of better-class people, who are direct sufferers from the war, instead of the destitute poor, for whom it was intended, but who, it develops, were not in need of it." 2. Whether the said article is accurate. If not, in what respect it is inaccurate. Presented March 20, 1916.—*Mr. Papineau.*
Not printed.

198*a*. Return showing:—1. Whether the Government is aware that the following extract from an article was published on the 12th January, 1915, in the Montreal "Gazette":—

"Distress Caused in England by War is Negligible.—Comparatively Small Portion of Colonial Gifts Used for National Relief.—Much Went to Belgians.—War Office also took Large Share.—Salvation Army has Scheme Requiring Canadian Co-operation.—(Special cable from the "Gazette's" resident staff correspondent.)

"London, January 11.—Very satisfactory evidence of the comparative absence in England of any distress caused by the war is furnished by a report on the special work of the Local Government Board arising out of the war, which was issued to-day as a White Paper. The action by Noel Kershaw, dealing with the disposition of the gifts from the Colonies, shows that only a small part of the goods allocated has been required for relieving the distress of civilians.

"The following is the disposition of the 940,530 bags of flour received from Canada: To the local committees for the relief of distress, 90,474; to the Belgian Refugees Committees, 1,691; transferred to the War Office, 99,760; further offer to the War Office, 300,000; to the Belgian Relief Commission, 443,886; sold, owing to damage, 4,719." 2. Who had charge of accepting delivery and the shipping of this flour. 3. Whether the Government have any information of the shortage of 59,430 bags of flour, alleged in said article. If not, what became of the flour that was short. Presented March 20, 1916.—*Mr. Papineau*.. .. ..*Not printed.*

CONTENTS OF VOLUME 28—*Continued.*

199. Return to an Order of the House of the 6th March, 1916, for a return showing the amounts contributed from the constituency of Medicine Hat for machine guns, and by whom contributed or forwarded. Presented March 21, 1916.—*Mr. Buchanan*.. ..*Not printed.*

200. Return to an Order of the House of the 13th March, 1916, for a copy of all letters, petitions, recommendations and other documents in the possession of the Post Office Department relating to the appointment of the postmaster at West Roachdale, Guysborough County, Nova Scotia, to take the place of J. H. McGuire, deceased. Presented March 21, 1916.—*Mr. Sinclair*.. .. ..*Not printed.*

201. Return to an Order of the House of the 28th February, 1916, for a return showing in detail the payment or payments amounting to $647.50, paid to P. A. Stoddart, fishery guardian, Shelburne County, N.S., during the year ending March 31, 1915. Presented March 21, 1916.—*Mr. Kyte*.. .. ..*Not printed.*

202. Return to an Order of the House of the 28th February, 1916, for a copy of all correspondence, letters, telegrams and documents of all kinds relating to the chartering of the vessel *Starling*, by the Department of Marine and Fisheries. Presented March 21, 1916. *Mr. Kyte*.. .. ..*Not printed.*

203. Return to an Order of the House of the 7th February, 1916, for a copy of all documents, letters, messages, correspondence and reports concerning a conference between the Minister of Agriculture and certain representatives of the Mennonite Church in or about July, 1873, and referred to in a certain letter dated 23rd July, 1873, signed by P. M. Lowe, Secretary of the Department of Agriculture, and addressed to Messrs. David Klassen, Jacob Peters, Heinrich Wiebe and Cornelius Toews, delegates from Southern Russia. Presented March 21, 1916.—*Mr. McCraney*.. .. ..*Not printed.*

204. Return to an Order of the House of the 13th March, 1916, for a copy of all letters, telegrams, petitions, memorials and other documents relating to the subsidizing by the Government of the construction of ships in British Columbia, or of ships when built; or as to the laying down or constructing or assisting in the construction in British Columbia of twenty-five ships by the Government, or as to assisting by subsidies or otherwise in the construction of ships in the Dominion. Presented March 23, 1916.—*Mr. Macdonald*. *Not printed.*

205. Return to an Order of the House of the 13th March, 1916, for a copy of the affidavit of David W. McLean, Windsor, N.S., to whom Warrant No. 25737 was issued for Fenian Raid Bounty, and also a copy of all correspondence and other documents relating to the payment of the same. Presented March 23, 1916.—*Mr. Macdonald*. .. ..*Not printed.*

206. Return to an Order of the House of the 9th March, 1916, for a return showing:—1. The amount collected in wharfage on goods landed on Government wharves in the county of Victoria, at Neils Harbour, Ingonish, Englishtown, South Gut, Baddeck, Little Narrows, Nyaiga, and Big Bras d'Or. 2. The amount collected at each of the above places, by whom collected, and how much returned to the Government in each case. Presented March 27, 1916.—*Mr. McKenzie*.. .. ..*Not printed.*

207. Return to an Order of the House of the 20th March, 1916, for a return showing:—The names of the 54 Canadian officers employed in the Canadian Pay and Record Office, London, and amounts per month paid to each of them. Presented March 27, 1916.—*Mr. Macdonald*.. .. ..*Not printed.*

208. Return to an Order of the House of the 3rd February, 1916, for a copy of all letters, telegrams, petitions, directions and other documents relative to the surveys for a railway under the Railway Department, which have been carried on during the past summer, at points east and west from Sunnybrae, in the county of Pictou. Presented March 27, 1916.—*Mr. Macdonald*.. .. ..*Not printed.*

209. Return to an Order of the House of the 21st February, 1916, for a copy of all papers, agreements, letters, telegrams and other documents relating to the proposal to purchase, lease, or use of, the railway known as the Vale Railway, county of Pictou, and to the operation of the same by the Railway Department. Presented March 27, 1916.—*Mr. Macdonald*.. .. ..*Not printed.*

210. Return to an Order of the House of the 7th February, 1916, for a return showing the number and purpose of all commissions appointed by the Government since 1911, and the cost of each, together with names of the various members of such commissions. Presented March 27, 1916.—*Mr. Pardee*.. .. ..*Not printed.*

211. Return to an Order of the House of the 6th March, 1916, for a copy of all correspondence, letters, telegrams and documents relating to the dismissal or resignation of Dr. W. T. Patton from the service of the Veterinary Inspection Branch of the Department of the Interior, and his re-appointment and his later dismissal or resignation. Presented March 27, 1916.—*Mr. Buchanan*.. .. ..*Not printed.*

CONTENTS OF VOLUME 28—*Continued.*

211*a*. Return to an Order of the House of the 3rd April, 1916, for a copy of all correspondence, letters, telegrams and documents relating to the dismissal or resignation of Dr. W. T. Patton, from the service of the Veterinary Inspection Branch of the Department of Agriculture at Coutts, Alberta, and his re-appointment and later dismissal or resignation. Presented May 10, 1916.—*Mr. Buchanan*.. .. ..*Not printed.*

212. Return to an Order of the House of the 28th February, 1916, for a copy of all accounts, telegrams, letters, bills of costs and other documents relating to the case of J. P. Dionne against the King, before the Exchequer Court, in which case Mr. Leo Bérubé was attorney and Mr. E. H. Cimon was counsel, both being lawyers of Fraserville. Presented March 27, 1916.—*Mr. Gauvreau*.. .. ..*Not printed*

212*a*. Return to an Order of the House of the 5th April, 1916, for a copy of all telegrams and letters from Leo Berube, lawyer, M.P.P., to the Minister of Justice, relating to the production of the official and public documents asked for by C. A. Gauvreau, M.P., in the case of J. P. Dionne vs. The King, and of any answers of the Minister of Justice to such telegrams and letters. Presented April 10, 1916.—*Mr. Gauvreau*.. .. .. ..*Not printed*

213. Return to an Address to His Royal Highness the Governor General, of the 7th February, 1916, for a copy of all correspondence with the Imperial authorities in connection with the purchase of horses, and the prohibiting of the export of horses. Presented March 27, 1916.—*Sir Wilfrid Laurier*.. .. ..*Not printed.*

214. Return to an Order of the House of the 1st March, 1916, for a copy of all correspondence, telegrams, reports and documents of all kinds relating to the visits of a fair wage officer to New Glasgow, N.S., in connection with the schedule of wages of men employed in works making shells at that place. Presented March 28, 1916.—*Mr. Macdonald.*
Not printed.

215. Copy of Order in Council P.C. No. 634, dated 24th March, 1916, *re* the prohibition of the exportation of certain goods including nickel, nickel ore and nickel matte, to certain foreign ports. Presented by Sir Robert Borden, March 28, 1916.
Printed for sessional papers only.

216. Return to an Order of the House of the 6th March, 1916, for a copy of all correspondence, accounts, vouchers, memoranda, etc., relating to the construction of a launch way and boat house at Bear Cove Beach, Halifax County, N.S., and completed in 1914. Presented March 29, 1916.—*Mr. Maclean (Halifax)*.. .. ..*Not printed.*

217. Return to an Order of the House of the 6th March, 1916, for a detailed statement of the expenditure last year at McNair's Cove, Nova Scotia, giving the names of the workmen, the number thus employed, the amount paid to each; also the amount paid for supplies and material, and the names of the persons to whom the same was paid. Presented March 29, 1916.—*Mr. Chisholm (Antigonish)*.. .. ..*Not printed.*

218. Return to an Order of the House of the 6th March, 1916, for a copy of all correspondence, accounts, vouchers, receipts, etc., in connection with the construction of a wharf at Shad Bay, Halifax County, N.S., in 1914 and 1915. Presented March 29, 1916.—*Mr. Maclean (Halifax)*.. .. ..*Not printed.*

219. Return to an Order of the House of the 16th March, 1916, for a return showing:—1. Whether the Government has received any complaints as to the manner of supplying clothing to the Royal Military College, or as to its fit, workmanship or materials employed, or as to any delay in furnishing the cadets with clothing. 2. If so, from whom such complaints have been received. 3. On what grounds. 4. What form the complaint was in. 5. The nature of the complaint. 6. If the Government is aware as to whether or not there has been dissatisfaction as to the fit, workmanship and materials employed, or as to any delay in furnishing the cadets with clothing. 7. If it is true, as alleged, that the late Commandant of the Royal Military College, Colonel Crowe, before he left, recommended a change of system for the supply of clothing, and outlined the features of such a system. 8. If so, the details of the plan suggested. 9. To what extent the plan suggested by Colonel Crowe was adopted. If not adopted, why not. 10. Whether the present Commandant of the Royal Military College made any suggestions as to a change in the system of supplying clothing to the cadets. 11. If so, the changes which he suggested. Presented March 30, 1916.—*Mr. Carvell.*
Not printed.

220. Escape of alien enemies from detention camps at Amherst, N.S.—(*Senate*)..*Not printed.*

221. Return to an Order of the House of the 21st February, 1916, for a copy of all letters, petitions, papers, telegrams, tenders and other documents relating to the establishment of a rural mail route from Alma, through Sylvester and Loch Broom, and as to the closing of the post offices at Sylvester and Loch Broom. Presented March 31, 1916.—*Mr. Macdonald*.. .. ..*Not printed.*

CONTENTS OF VOLUME 28—*Continued.*

222. Return to an Order of the House of the 3rd February, 1916, for a copy of all petitions, letters, papers, telegrams, tenders and other documents relating to the establishment of rural mail route from Scotsburn to North Scotsburn, Rogers Hill and Hardwood Hill, and as to the closing of any post offices on said route. Presented March 31, 1916.—*Mr. Macdonald*.. .. .. .

CONTENTS OF VOLUME 28—*Continued.*

232. Return to an Order of the House of the 15th March, 1916, for a copy of all letters, telegrams and petitions in the possession or under the control of the Post Office Department having reference to the dismissal of Postmaster McRitchie at North River Centre, Victoria County, Nova Scotia, and to the appointment of Neil McLeod in his place. Presented April 5, 1914.—*Mr. McKenzie*.. .. ..*Not printed.*

233. Return to an Order of the House of the 27th March, 1916, for a copy of all petitions, correspondence, telegrams, recommendations and other papers or documents in the possession of the Postmaster General or his department, relating to the dismissal of James Hall, Postmaster at Milford Haven Bridge, Guysborough County, Nova Scotia, and the appointment of Guy O'Connor, as his successor. Presented April 5, 1916.—*Mr. Sinclair* *Not printed.*

234. Return to an Order of the House of the 7th February, 1916, for a report showing the apportioning of electoral polling divisions in Manitoba, made by judges under authority of the Dominion Elections Act, 7-8 Edward VII, Chapter 26. Presented April 5, 1916.—*Sir Wilfrid Laurier*.. .. ..*Not printed.*

235. Return to an Order of the House of the 23rd February, 1916, for a copy of all profiles, reports, correspondence and all documents concerning the construction of a viaduct at Amqui, on the Intercolonial Railway, at the place called Traverse Dubé, Duhé Crossing; also of the plans of properties belonging to the Intercolonial Railway at Amqui, and of the land leased to the Municipality of Amqui, with a copy of the lease affecting such land. Presented April 5, 1916.—*Mr. Lapointe (Kamouraska)*.. .. ..*Not printed.*

236. Return to an Order of the House of the 20th March, 1916, for a return showing the number of horses bought for remounts in Alberta, the persons from whom they were purchased, and the amount paid for each horse. Presented April 6, 1916.—*Mr. Buchanan.* *Not printed.*

237. Return to an Order of the House of the 15th March, 1916, for a return showing:—1. Who has been furnishing food, clothing and other necessary supplies to the soldiers at North Sydney and Sydney Mines, since the 4th August, 1914, to the 1st February, 1916. 2. The names and amounts paid to each, and amounts due to each on 1st February, 1916, over and above what has already been paid. 3. Whether the said supplies of all kinds were obtained or called for by public tender. If so, how the tenders were called, and who the tenderers were. 4. If the contracts for such supplies were always given to the lowest tenderer. 5. The names of those who tendered, and the figures of the tenders in each case. 6. The different methods by which tenders were invited, and for what classes of merchandise or supplies. Presented April 6, 1916.—*Mr. McKenzie*.. ..*Not printed.*

238. Order in Council No. P.C. 680, dated 23rd March, 1916, respecting the application of the Industrial Disputes Investigation Act, 1907, in the case of disputes between employers and employees affecting the delivery of war supplies. Presented by Hon. Mr. Roche, April 6, 1916.. .. ..*Not printed.*

239. Return to an Order of the House of the 13th March, 1916, for a copy of all the evidence taken by the Commission appointed to inquire into claims for damages made against the Militia Department in the town of Sydney Mines, Nova Scotia, and of the report made upon each claim or case, said claims being for damages to lands and other property. Presented April 7, 1916.—*Mr. McKenzie*.. .. ..*Not printed.*

240 Return to an Order of the House of the 1st March, 1916, for a copy of all letters, correspondence and telegrams between the Speaker, the Clerk of the House of Commons, the Civil Service Commission and the Minister of Finance in regard to the proposed appointment of Mr. H. Crossley Sherwood, as Assistant Clerk of Routine and Records, from 1st October, 1914, down to the present date. Presented April 7, 1916.—*Mr. Turriff.* *Not printed.*

240*a*. Supplementary Return to an Order of the House of the 1st March, 1916, for a copy of all letters, correspondence and telegrams between the Speaker, the Clerk of the House of Commons, the Civil Service Commission and the Minister of Finance in regard to the proposed appointment of Mr. H. Crossley Sherwood, as Assistant Clerk of Routine and Records, from 1st October, 1914, down to the present date. Presented April 10, 1916.—*Mr. Turriff*.. .. ..*Not printed.*

241. Return to an Order of the House of the 20th March, 1916, for a copy of all recommendations, letters, telegrams and correspondence relating to the recent appointment of a lightkeeper at Arisaig, N.S. Presented April 7, 1916.—*Mr. Chisholm (Antigonish).* *Not printed.*

242. Return to an Order of the Senate dated 31st March, 1916:—For a copy of all papers, letters and all correspondence regarding the passport granted to W. F. Bauman, an alien enemy. The said Bauman is a Bavarian.—(*Senate*).. .. ..*Not printed.*

CONTENTS OF VOLUME 28—*Continued.*

243. Return to an Order of the House of the 3rd February, 1916, for a copy of all letters, telegrams, or other communications sent to the Government or any member or department thereof before 15th August, 1914, pointing out the necessity of granting relief to the settlers in the drouth-stricken area of Alberta. Presented April 10, 1916.—*Mr. Buchanan*.. .. .. .

CONTENTS OF VOLUME 28—*Continued.*

254. Return to an Order of the House of the 21st February, 1916, for a copy of all letters, papers, telegrams and other documents relating to the survey in the harbour of Pictou, for a proposed new bridge, by the Railway Department; and also a statement showing the amounts paid in connection with said survey, the names of the persons to whom paid, and the purposes for which they were paid. Presented April 11, 1916.—*Mr. Macdonald*.. .. .. .

CONTENTS OF VOLUME 28—*Continued.*

265. Return to an Order of the House of the 12th April, 1916, for a return showing:—1. How many clerks there are in the Finance Department who belong to and are paid from the outside service vote and who work in the inside service. 2. The names of said clerks. 3. Salary paid to each. 4. How long each has been in the service of the Department. 5. If all or any of these clerks have passed any examination. If so, what examination and on what date or dates. Presented April 26, 1916.—*Mr. Turriff*.. .. ..*Not printed.*

266. Return to an Order of the House of the 23rd February, 1916, for a return showing:—1. The number of permanent employees in the Department of Inland Revenue in 1915-16. 2. How many there will be in 1916-17. 3. How much money was paid in salaries for temporary employees in each of the following years: 1912-13, 1913-14, 1914-15 and 1915-16. 4. The names of the temporary employees and the dates of their appointment, respectively. Presented April 26, 1916.—*Mr. Lanctot*.. .. ..*Not printed.*

267. Return to an Order of the Senate dated the 14th instant, showing the number of men recruited up to the first day of April, 1916.—(*Senate*).. .. ..*Not printed.*

268. Return to an Order of the Senate, dated the 23rd day of March, 1916, of all papers and documents dealing with the escapes and the liberation of alien enemy prisoners from the detention camp situated at Banff, in the province of Alberta. Ordered, That the same do lie on the table.—(*Senate*).. .. ..*Not printed.*

269. Return to an Order of the House of the 19th April, 1916, for a return showing:—1 Whether there is a Director of Recruiting and Organizations in England for the Canadian Service. 2. If so, his name and duties. 3. The number employed upon his staff. 4. The total expenses of his staff. Presented April 28, 1916.. .. ..*Not printed.*

270. Return to an Order of the Senate, dated 11th instant:—For a copy of an application made by Rev. Isaac Hunter Macdonald, of Kintore, Ontario, to the Militia Department for a position of chaplain or major; also, of all copies of letters, papers or telegrams either recommending or opposing said application.—(*Senate*).. .. ..*Not printed.*

271. Return to an Address to His Royal Highness the Governor General of the 29th March, 1916, for a copy of all petitions received by the Governor General in Council requesting the disavowal of the Act of the Legislature of the Province of Ontario, Chapter 45, 5 George V, 1915, concerning the School Commission of the Roman Catholic Schools of the City of Ottawa, and of all documents, memoranda, reports, letters and correspondence concerning the said petitions for disavowal, or concerning the said Act of the Legislature of the Province of Ontario, 5 George V, Chapter 45. Presented May 1, 1916.—*Mr. Lapointe* (*Kamouraska*).. .. ..*Not printed.*

271*a*. Order in Council and Report of Minister of Justice transmitting to Lieutenant Governor of Ontario copy of petition from Samuel Genest and others, praying for the disallowance of an Act of the Legislature of Ontario, Chapter 45 of 5 George V (1915). Order in Council and Report of Minister of Justice on the Statutes of the Legislature of Ontario, passed in the 5th year of His Majesty's reign (1915). Report of Prime Minister of Ontario on petition relating to the disallowance of an Act of the Legislature of Ontario, Chapter 45 of 5 George V (1915). Presented May 3, 1916.—*Mr. Lapointe* (*Kamouraska*).. .. ..*Printed for sessional papers only.*

272. Return to an Order of the House of the 20th March, 1916, for a copy of all telegrams, letters, correspondence and contracts between the Quebec Harbour Commission and Benjamin Demers, of the parish of St. Nicolas, county of Lévis, concerning the purchase of the St. Nicolas quarry. Presented May 1, 1916.—*Mr. Bourassa*.. .. ..*Not printed.*

273. Return to an Order of the House of the 13th March, 1916, for a return showing a list of vessels belonging to the Canadian Government which are on service under the provision of the Canadian Naval Act, and of all vessels not now in service and their present condition and suitability for service, and also for a copy of all letters, petitions or communications had by or with the Government in regard to the establishment of a Canadian Naval Brigade. Presented May 1, 1916.—*Mr. Macdonald*.. .. .. ..*Not printed.*

274. Return to an Order of the House of the 29th March, 1916, for a copy of all correspondence, petitions and papers, including the report of Charles Bruce, engineer, in the possession of the Department of Marine and Fisheries relating to the construction of a bait freezer at White Head, Nova Scotia. Presented May 1, 1916.—*Mr. Sinclair*

Not printed.

275. Duplicate Return to an Order of the House of the 17th March, 1915, for a copy of all correspondence and reports relating to the purchase of 25,000 shovels of special pattern, mentioned in Order in Council P.C. 2302, dated 4th September, 1914, on page 38 of memoranda respecting work of the Department of Militia and Defence, and also relating to any further purchases of such shovels. Presented May 1, 1916.—*Mr. Hughes* (*P.E.I.*).. .. ..*Not printed.*

CONTENTS OF VOLUME 28—*Continued.*

276. Return to an Order of the House of the 5th April, 1916, for a copy of all letters, telegrams, offers, tenders, reports, contracts and documents relating to the sale or other disposal of small arms ammunition since 4th August, 1914. Presented May 1, 1916.—*Mr. Macdonald*.. .. .. .

CONTENTS OF VOLUME 28—*Continued.*

284. Return to an Order of the House of the 27th March, 1916, for a return showing the names and addresses of all persons in the Public Service of any and every Department of the Government of Canada, in the counties of Cape Breton, Victoria, Inverness, Richmond, Guysborough, Antigonish and Pictou, Province of Nova Scotia. Presented May 4, 1916. —*Mr. Carroll*.. .. .. .

CONTENTS OF VOLUME 28—*Concluded.*

295a. Correspondence in respect to the offer of sale to the Government of Canada of the Quebec, Montmorency and Charlevoix Railway, the Quebec and Saguenay Railway and the Lotbinière and Megantic Railway. Presented by Hon. Mr. Reid, May 16, 1916.
Not printed.

296. Return to an Address to His Royal Highness the Governor General of the 1st March, 1916, for a copy of all correspondence, letters, telegrams, Orders in Council, etc., relating to the transfer by the Government of Ontario to the Government of Canada, of the rights held by the former in the lakes, dams, etc., contiguous to or forming a part of the Trent Valley Waterways System. Presented May 17, 1916.—*Mr. Graham.*
Not printed.

297. Return to an Order of the House of the 1st May, 1916, for a copy of all papers, telegrams, letters and other documents in connection with the decision to locate an interior storage elevator at Calgary, Alberta. Presented May 17, 1916.. .. ..*Not printed.*

298. Return to an Order of the House of the 12th April, 1916, for a return showing the plan and description of the proposed permanent harbour quay line in the harbour at Pictou, and for a copy of all papers, letters, telegrams and other documents relating to the establishment of the same. Presented May 17, 1916.—*Mr. Macdonald .. ..Not printed.*

299. Return to an Order of the House of the 21st February, 1916, for a copy of all tenders, offers, letters, telegrams and other documents relating to the arrangements for the handling of freight and coal at Pictou, in connection with the boats engaged in the winter service between Pictou and Prince Edward Island during the year 1914-1915, and during the present season. Presented May 18, 1916.—*Mr. Macdonald .. .. ..Not printed.*

TENTH REPORT

OF THE

BOARD OF RAILWAY COMMISSIONERS FOR CANADA

FOR THE YEAR ENDING MARCH 31

1915

PRINTED BY ORDER OF PARLIAMENT.

OTTAWA
PRINTED BY J. DE L. TACHE,
PRINTER TO THE KING'S MOST EXCELLENT MAJESTY
1916

[No. 20c—1916.]

THE BOARD OF RAILWAY COMMISSIONERS FOR CANADA.

H. L. Drayton, K.C., *Chief Commissioner.*

D'Arcy Scott, *Assistant Chief Commissioner.*

Hon. W. B. Nantel, K.C., LL.D., *Deputy Chief Commissioner.*

S. J. McLean, *Commissioner.*

A. S. Goodeve, *Commissioner.*

CONTENTS.

	PAGE
Accidents and accident investigations	11
American Coal and Coke Company v. Michigan Central Railroad Company	7
Applications to the board	10
Appeals from decisions of the board	9
British Columbia Central Farmers' Institutes v. Canadian Pacific Railway Company	9
Canadian Lumbermen's Association and Montreal Board of Trade v. Grand Trunk, Canadian Pacific and Canadian Northern Railway Companies	5
Dominion Sugar Company v. Grand Trunk, Canadian Pacific, Chatham, Wallaceburg and Lake Erie and Pere Marquette Railway Companies	4
Dominion Transportation Company v. Algoma Central and Hudson Bay Railway Company	6
Engineering Department of the board	10
Farmers' Dairy and Produce Company v. Canadian Pacific Railway Company	5
Fire Inspection Department of the board	12
Fonthill Gravel Company, Ltd., v. Niagara, St. Catharines and Toronto and Grand Trunk Railway Companies	4
Formal and informal matters	1
Fredericton Board of Trade v. Canadian Pacific Railway Company	9
General Decisions and Rulings of the board	3
General Orders issued by the board	3
Judgments of the board	10
Mountain Lumber Manufacturers' Association v. Canadian Pacific Railway Company (Golden Toll Case)	8
Newman v. Bell Telephone Company	5
Noviciat de Notre Dame des Anges v. Bell Telephone Company	6
Oliver-Scrim Lumber Company v. Canadian Pacific and Esquimalt and Nanaimo Railway Companies	8
Operating Department of the board	11
Orders, General Orders and Circulars	10
Port Hope Telephone Company, Ltd., and Bell Telephone Company of Canada—Jurisdiction of board	4
Public sittings of the board	1
Railway Grade Crossing Fund	2
Randall, Gee & Mitchell v. Canadian Pacific Railway Company	7
Routine work of the Board—Record Department—Secretary's Department	13
Roy v. Canadian Passenger Association	8
St. David's Sand Company v. Grand Trunk and Michigan Central Railway Companies	7
St. John and Quebec Railway Company v. Canadian Pacific Railway Company	6
Stoltze Manufacturing Company v. Canadian Pacific Railway and Western Canada Power Companies	8
Traffic Department of the board	10
Unjust discrimination—Massiah v. Canadian Pacific Railway Company	5
Unjust discrimination—Edmonton Clover Bar Sand Company v. Grand Trunk Pacific Railway Company	6

APPENDICES.

PAGE

Appendix "A"—List of complaints filed with the board for the year ending March 31, 1915. 14

Appendix "B"—List of applications heard at public sittings of the board for the year ending March 31, 1915. 48

Appendix "C"—Principal judgments of the board for the year ending March 31, 1915. 120

(For alphabetical index to judgments see page 459.)

Appendix "D"—Report of the Chief Traffic Officer of the board for the year ending March 31, 1915. 348

Appendix "E"—Report of the Chief Engineer for the year ending March 31, 1915. 357

Appendix "F"—Report of the Chief Operating Officer of the Board for the year ending March 31, 1915. 374

Appendix "G"—Board's staff and salaries for year ending March 31, 1915. . . . 421

Appendix "H"—Report of the Chief Fire Inspector of the board for the year ending March 31, 1915. 425

Appendix "I"—List of books in the library for the year ending March 31, 1915. 429

Appendix "J"—List of applications subdivided under sections of the Act. . . . 438

Appendix "K"—List of cases carried to the Supreme Court. 440

Appendix "L"—List of General Orders and Circulars of the board for the year ending Mareh 31, 1915. 443

REPORT

OF THE

BOARD OF RAILWAY COMMISSIONERS

FOR CANADA.

To the Governor in Council:

Pursuant to the provisions of section 62 of the Railway Act, as amended by section 12 of chapter 32, 8-9 Edward VII, the Board of Railway Commissioners for Canada has the honour to submit its Tenth Report for the year ending March 31, 1915.

Since the submission of the board's last report there have been no further amendments to the Railway Act, though consolidation and further important amendments to the Act are under consideration.

PUBLIC SITTINGS OF THE BOARD.

During the year covered by the period from April 1, 1914, to March 31, 1915, the board held 86 public sittings, at which 753 applications were heard, as compared with 81 public sittings for the previous year, at which 702 applications were heard, being an increase in the number of applications heard of 51 for the year. The number of public sittings held in the various provinces were as follows:—

In the province of		Ontario	53
"	"	Quebec	5
"	"	Nova Scotia	1
"	"	New Brunswick	2
"	"	Manitoba	6
"	"	Saskatchewan	6
"	"	Alberta	6
"	"	British Columbia	7

The applications heard at the various sittings of the board cover a variety of matters which fall within its jurisdiction under the Railway Act dealing with the application of a private individual to matters of general public interest affecting the community as a whole.

FORMAL AND INFORMAL MATTERS.

The number of informal matters dealt with by the board, as distinguished from matters heard at its formal sittings, constitutes a large percentage of the total applications and complaints dealt with by the board, that is to say, of a total of 4,050 applications and complaints received and dealt with by the board only 18½ per cent were set down for a formal hearing, and 81½ per cent were disposed of without the necessity of a formal hearing.

Attention may properly be again directed to the fact that these informal complaints, settled without a hearing, entail in many instances a considerable amount of inquiry and consideration on the part of the board's officers, and cover a wide range of subjects, such as, for example, the complaint of an individual regarding an overcharge in a railway fare for a small amount, or the matter of lost baggage, to a matter of general public interest affecting the community at large, such as the question of a railway rate involving the application of a general principle.

A list of the formal complaints heard at the various sittings of the board, together with the disposal made thereof, will be found under Appendix "B," and a list of the informal matters dealt with by the board will be found under Appendix "A."

RAILWAY GRADE CROSSING FUND.

In accordance with the provisions of section 7, of 8-9 Edward VII, chapter 32, entitled an Act to amend the Railway Act, provision was made that the sum of $200,000 each year, for five consecutive years from the 1st day of April, 1909, was appropriated and set apart from the Consolidated Revenue Fund for the purpose of aiding in the providing by actual construction work of protection safety, and conveniences for the public in respect of highway crossings of the railway at rail level, in existence on the said first day of April, the said sums to be placed to credit of a special account to be known as "The Railway Grade Crossing Fund," to be applied by the board, subject to certain limitations set out in the amending Act, solely towards the cost (not including that of maintenance and operation) of actual construction work for the purpose specified.

In dealing with such crossings, the board issued, between the first day of April, 1909, and March 31, 1915, 311 orders providing protection as follows:—

By electric bells	185
" gates	80
" subways	46
" overhead bridges	20
" diversion of highways	15
" closing of streets	3
" removal of hill	1
Total number of crossings protected	350

It will be seen by comparing the total number of crossings protected with the Ninth Annual Report of the board that the increase for the year ending March 31, 1915, in the number of crossings protected, numbers 44 made up as follows:—

By electric bells	24
" gates	12
" subways	5
" overhead bridges	1
" diversion of highways	1
" closing of streets	1
Total increase in number of crossings protected	44

In connection with the granting of aid to protective works under this fund, attention is again directed to the fact that the board has found that the limitation imposed by the Act has prevented contributions being made in as large a degree as would seem to be proper in the public interest in connection with the larger schemes for elimination of grade crossings. Such works in the larger cities will run into amounts exceeding $100,000, and occasionally as high as several million dollars, so that the limitation of $5,000 (not to be applied to more than three crossings in any one municipality, or more than once to any one crossing), fixed by the Act, would be a mere fraction of the total amount involved.

SESSIONAL PAPER No. 20c

GENERAL DECISIONS AND RULINGS OF THE BOARD.

Submitted herewith are some of the more important matters dealt with by the board at its public sittings for the year ending March 31, 1915. The various judgments "in extenso" will be found under Appendix "C" to this report.

GENERAL ORDERS ISSUED BY THE BOARD.

The following is a brief statement of some of the matters dealt with under General Orders of the Board:—

Operation by railway companies subject to the jurisdiction of the board, of draw or swing or bascule bridges over navigable waters and the question of regulations governing such operation.

Provision that all reports on fires originating within 300 feet of a railway track and burning over an area of 100 square feet or more outside the right of way, submitted by the railway companies in accordance with the requirements of the Board's Circular No. 133, be privileged and shall only be made public or given out, upon an application therefor, by order of the board.

Provision for the putting up and taking down of marker lights on cabooses on trains, all cabooses to be equipped as provided in the order, on or before November 1, 1914.

The matter of increased special and competitive freight and express tolls and suspensions thereof.

The matter of tariffs filed by certain railway companies requiring additional railway tickets for the exclusive use of drawing rooms or compartments in sleeping and parlour cars.

Provision that locomotive engines of railway companies be not allowed to leave terminals, or to be used at terminals in traffic service on which the following defects exist, namely: steam leaks, air brakes, wheel defects, springs; and further provision that railway companies are required on or before January 1, 1915, to equip their locomotives with double windows in the front of the cabs during the winter season, from November 1 to April 30; the same to be made air-tight.

The matter of the cancellation of mixing privileges in connection with carloads of groceries, dried fruit, and liquors from Eastern Canada points to points in Western Canada.

Suspension of the proposed cancellation on January 1, 1915, of the arrangements whereby mixed carloads of foreign and native liquors, and mixed carloads of groceries are carried.

Provision that railway companies making application to the board to open for traffic their line, under section 261 of the Railway Act, be required to publish and file the appropriate supplementary special class or "town" tariffs, mileage commodity tariffs, and special tariffs on grain to the Lake Superior terminals, and on lumber from British Columbia, as these may be applicable to the territories to be served by the said new lines, in addition to the standard mileage tariffs therefor.

Provision that through rates of freight on newsprint paper, in carloads of 40,000 pounds minimum weight, from the points of shipment thereof, by the all-rail route, to the Canadian points of consumption west of Fort William, be made by the addition to the 5th class published tariff rates from Port Arthur and Fort William of the special arbitraries set out in the board's order; and that these through rates be published and filed to take effect not later than April 15, 1915.

Approval of a form of "release," being a form of special contract limiting the liability of the carrier in respect of the limitation of responsibility in connection with the carriage of household goods, furniture and settlers' effects, all second hand.

FONTHILL GRAVEL COMPANY, LTD., V. NIAGARA, ST. CATHARINES AND TORONTO AND GRAND TRUNK RAILWAY COMPANIES.

The complaint was that the toll of $1 a ton on moulding sand from Fonthill to Toronto was unreasonable, and application was made that the former rate of 90 cents a ton, in force prior to July 1, 1912, be re-established.

The facts are fully set out in the judgment of Mr. Commissioner McLean, February 9, 1914.

Held, that a through toll of $1 per ton on moulding sand from Fonthill to Toronto, a distance of 78 miles, whereof the Grand Trunk Railway Company receives 78 cents and the Niagara, St. Catharines and Toronto Railway Company 22 cents was held not unreasonable.

PORT HOPE TELEPHONE COMPANY, LTD., AND BELL TELEPHONE COMPANY OF CANADA. JURISDICTION OF BOARD.

The Port Hope Telephone Company applied for a ruling that the applicant company is not a competitive company in competition with the Bell Company, and for an order directing a connection of the lines of the two companies for the interchange of business at Bowmanville.

Held, that the provisions of the Railway Act, 7-8 Edward VII, chapter 61, defining the jurisdiction of the board in regard to telephones, are applicable only in so far as companies are concerned to companies within the legislative authority of the Parliament of Canada. A telephone company not within such legislative authority cannot invoke the power of the board on an allegation of discriminatory treatment on the part of a company subject to the board's jurisdiction.

That the words "competing" and "non-competing," as describing telephone companies, are not words of legal precision. They have been brought before the board as the result of the business practice of the Bell Company for the purpose of distinguishing between companies with which it (the Bell) has made agreements and those with which it has not made agreements. The discretion of the company in this respect is not limited by statute.

The board has power, under subsections 5 and 6 of section 4 of 7-8 Edward VII, chapter 61, to order a company, subject to its jurisdiction, to afford to another company, whether subject or not, the use of its long distance system, upon such terms as to compensation as the board deems just and expedient.

Jurisdiction of board is to make an order on terms, not a declaratory order as to status.

For reasons for judgment see judgment Mr. Commissioner McLean, March 30, 1914, page 133 of judgments, orders and regulations of board.

DOMINION SUGAR CO. V. GRAND TRUNK, CANADIAN PACIFIC, CHATHAM, WALLACEBURG AND LAKE ERIE AND PERE MARQUETTE RAILWAY COMPANY.

A carrier by rail may be justified in reducing tolls from one point to another to meet effective water competition between those points, notwithstanding that the lowered toll appears discriminatory as against a third point, which is not affected by such competition, and which is, therefore, subject to higher tolls, but a continuance of the competitive toll, after the water competition ceases or is suspended (e.g., in winter), constitutes unjust discrimination against such third point.

Dominion Sugar Co. *v.* Grand Trunk, Canadian Pacific, Chatham, Wallaceburg and Lake Erie and Pere Marquette Railway Companies, 17 Can. Ry. Cas. 231, reheard and reversed.

Montreal Board of Trade *v.* Grand Trunk and Canadian Pacific Railway Companies, 14 Can. Ry. Cas. 351; Blind River Board of Trade *v.* Grand Trunk, Canadian Pacific Railway, Northern Navigation and Dominion Transportation Companies, 15 Can. Ry. Cas. 146, followed.

The facts are fully set out in the judgment of Chief Commissioner Drayton, April 30, 1914, 17 Can. Ry. Cas. 240.

CANADIAN LUMBERMEN'S ASSOCIATION AND MONTREAL BOARD OF TRADE V. GRAND TRUNK, CANADIAN PACIFIC, AND CANADIAN NORTHERN RAILWAY COMPANIES.

The board has on many occasions decided that the extent to which carriers may meet water competition, as long as there is no unjust discrimination, is within their own discretion.

Application to direct the said railway companies to re-establish the tolls on lumber for export and domestic use to Montreal of last year, which had been raised one-half a cent and one cent per 100 pounds.

The facts are fully set out in the judgment of Assistant Chief Commissioner Scott, of May 9, 1914, 17 Can. Ry. Cas., p. 102.

FARMERS' DAIRY AND PRODUCE CO. V. CANADIAN PACIFIC RAILWAY COMPANY.

The board ordered an express company to establish a commodity toll for carriage of milk by express for delivery to a connecting express company in the United States, and in so doing overruled the railway company's objection that it did not want the business unless at its full tariff tolls, but suspended operation of the order pending proof that a toll had been agreed upon with the foreign connecting carrier which would permit the carriage of the commodity to its destination in the foreign country.

The Farmers' Dairy and Produce Company of St. John, N.B., applied for an order directing a special rate on milk to Boston.

The facts are fully set out in the judgment of Chief Commissioner Drayton, May 22, 1911, 17 Can. Ry. Cas., 106.

UNJUST DISCRIMINATION, MASSIAH V. CANADIAN PACIFIC RY. CO.

Within the limits of the standard passenger tolls per mile, railway companies have discretion to vary the toll under certain conditions. That discretion may be exercised by the granting of commutation tolls to one point and not to another; such difference in the treatment of different places is not necessarily unjust discrimination, and in the absence of affirmative evidence of actual discrimination, resulting in the positive detriment to a place to which such tolls are refused, the board will not interfere.

Complaint of Mrs. Kate S. Massiah, of Lachute, Que., regarding discrimination shown by the Canadian Pacific Railway Company in issuing commutation tickets the year round to Ste. Agathe, Vaudreuil, Hudson, and other places, while none are issued between Lachute and Montreal, Que.

The facts are set out in the judgment of Mr. Commissioner McLean, May 22, 1914, 17 Can. Ry. Cas. 88.

NEWMAN V. BELL TELEPHONE CO.

A telephone in the residence of a market gardener and fruit raiser, who has no office telephone, is properly charged the business toll irrespective of the amount of user.

Bayly *v.* Bell Telephone Co., 11 Can. Ry. Cas. 190, followed.

Where it had been the custom to allow party line subscribers, so situated that they must pay excess mileage tolls, a reduction of one-fifth on the base toll, a discontinuance

of this reduction is not justified on the ground that a change of tolls in the primary toll area ordered by the board rendered obsolete party line service within that area. An order of the board extending the primary toll area is not sufficient justification for an increase in mileage tolls to subscribers situated beyond that area.

City of Montreal *v.* Bell Telephone Co. (Montreal Telephone Toll Case), 15 Can. Ry. Cas. 118, followed.

Application of a party line subscriber to direct the respondent to cease charging him a business toll, increasing it for excess mileage, and substituting individual line in place of party line tolls in the primary area.

The facts are fully set out in the judgment of Mr. Commissioner McLean, July 17, 1914, 17 Can. Ry. Cas. 271.

NOVICIAT DE NOTRE DAME DES ANGES V. BELL TELEPHONE CO.

A telephone in the house of a religious community is properly charged the business toll.

Newman *v.* Bell Telephone Co., 17 Can. Ry. Cas. 271, followed.

The facts are fully set out in the judgment of Mr. Commissioner McLean, July 17, 1914, 17 Can. Ry. Cas. 277.

UNJUST DISCRIMINATION—EDMONTON, CLOVER BAR SAND CO. V. GRAND TRUNK PACIFIC RAILWAY COMPANY.

A toll obtaining on one railway cannot be claimed to be unjustly discriminatory simply because a toll on another which is put into effect for competitive reasons, is lower, it being within the discretion of a carrier whether it shall meet competition or not.

Application to direct the railway company to equalize its tolls with those of another carrier serving its competitor on the ground of unjust discrimination.

The facts are fully set out in the judgment of Chief Commissioner Drayton, July 18, 1914, 17 Can. Ry. Cas. 95.

ST. JOHN AND QUEBEC RAILWAY V. CANADIAN PACIFIC RAILWAY CO.

Under section 176 the board, as a question of law, has no jurisdiction to authorize a provincial railway company to take and use the lands and tracks of a Dominion railway company, although under 1 and 2 Geo. V, chapter 22, section 5 (3), amending section 228, the board can make supplemental orders for the safe and proper transfer of engines and equipment of the provincial railway company by the Dominion railway company by means of a physical connection.

(Preston and Berlin Street Ry. Co. *v.* Grand Trunk Ry. Co., 6 Can. Ry. Cas. 142; St. John and Quebec Ry. Co. *v.* Canadian Pacific Ry. Co., 14 Can. Ry. Cas. 360, followed.)

Application for authority to take and use the lands and tracks of the respondent and order it to make a physical connection with the applicant.

The facts are fully set out in the judgment of Chief Commissioner Drayton, July 18, 1914, 17 Can. Ry. Cas. 334.

DOMINION TRANSPORTATION CO. V. ALGOMA CENTRAL AND HUDSON BAY RAILWAY CO.

The board, under sections 2 (21), 284, 317, has jurisdiction to direct the respondent to maintain its dock at Michipicoten harbour and provide facilities thereat for receiving, loading, carrying, unloading, and delivering traffic of the applicant in competition with traffic of the respondent.

Canadian Northern Ry. Co. *v.* Robinson & Son, 37 S.C.R. 541, 6 Can. Ry. Cas. 101, followed.

Application to direct the respondent to maintain its dock at Michipicoten Harbour so as to afford accommodation and facilities for the traffic of the applicant.

The facts are fully set out in the judgment of Chief Commissioner Drayton, July 31, 1914, 17 Can. Ry. Cas. 422.

SAINT DAVID'S SAND CO. V. GRAND TRUNK AND MICHIGAN CENTRAL RAILWAY COMPANIES.

The board, following the General Interswitching order, approved a joint toll of 50 cents per ton on sand over a distance of 12·3 miles (3 miles over M.C.R.R. and 9·3 miles over G.T.R.) from the sand pit to Merritton, subject to a minimum weight of 60,000 pounds.

(Doolittle and Wilcox *v.* Grand Trunk and Canadian Pacific Ry. Cos. (Stone Quarry Toll Case), 8 Can. Ry. Cas. 10, at p. 13; Continental, Prairie and Winnipeg Oil Cos. *v.* Canadian Pacific Ry. Co., 13 Can. Ry. Cas. 156, at p. 159; Canadian Manufacturers' Association *v.* Canadian Freight Association (General Interswitching Order), 7 Can. Ry. Cas. 302, followed.)

While it is justifiable to base differences in a toll on quantity as between C.L. and L.C.L. traffic movement, it is not justifiable to make a difference in a toll based on the distinction between carload and trainload movements.

Application for a joint toll of 40 cents per ton on trainload traffic moved from the applicants' pit to the Welland Ship Canal via Michigan Central and Grand Trunk Railways.

The facts are fully set out in the judgment of Mr. Commissioner McLean, October 23, 1914, 17 Can. Ry. Cas. 279.

RANDALL, GEE AND MITCHELL V. CANADIAN PACIFIC RAILWAY COMPANY.

The carriage of traffic (other than for construction purposes) before the railway has been authorized to be opened therefor, under section 261, is illegal, and no legal toll or tariff applies to such traffic.

Refunds apply where the railway company, performing a legal service, charges a greater toll than allowed by appropriate tariff on file with the board.

Baker, Reynolds & Co. *v.* Canadian Pacific Railway Co., 10 Can. Ry. Cas. 151, followed.

Application to direct a refund to be made of the difference between construction tariff tolls, and through grain tolls from Torquay and Outram respectively, to Fort William.

The facts are fully set out in the judgment of Chief Commissioner Drayton, November 19, 1914, 17 Can. Ry. Cas. 252.

AMERICAN COAL AND COKE CO. V. MICHIGAN CENTRAL RAILROAD COMPANY.

Contracts made in the United States for the carriage of carload traffic passing from one point to another in the United States through Canadian territory are under the control of the Interstate Commerce Commission, and the board (having regard to international comity) will not make an order as to demurrage charged for delay of such traffic in Canada, when no Canadian interest is involved, where the effect of such order would be to nullify the previous order of the Interstate Commerce Commission on the same subject matter.

Application to direct the railroad company to desist from holding cars in its freight terminals at Windsor, Ont., until switching orders for their delivery in Detroit, Mich., are received, and for a refund of the demurrage tolls charged during such detention.

The facts are fully set out in the A. C. and C. *v.* M.C.R.R.

Judgment of Chief Commissioner Drayton, December 4, 1914, 17 Can. Ry. Cas. 256.

ROY V. CANADIAN PASSENGER ASSOCIATION.

Application for special tolls for farmers desiring to attend agricultural conventions, conferences, and exhibitions.

Held, that under sections 77, 315 and 341, the board has no jurisdiction to compel a railway company to issue reduced tolls to farmers attending agricultural conventions, or to any other class of the community. It is entirely within the discretion of the carriers whether they will do so or not, and for the board to do so would be unjust discrimination against other classes of the community.

Canadian Fraternal Association *v.* Canadian Passenger Association, 13 Can. Ry. Cas., 178, followed.

Judgment, Chief Commissioner Drayton, January 5, 1915, 17 Can. Ry. Cas. 320.

STOLTZE MANUFACTURING CO. V. CANADIAN PACIFIC RAILWAY AND WESTERN CANADA POWER COMPANIES.

Application to direct the respondents to grant the construction toll on lumber used for construction purposes by the Canadian Pacific Railway Company.

Held, that the board has no jurisdiction to deal with questions of contract between shippers and purchasers, and therefore the parties are not bound by any finding of the board, except with regard to tolls.

When two connecting carriers are separate legal entities, and the former operates and tariffs the latter as a separate property, the latter is under no obligation to put a construction toll of the former into effect on its line, but the shipper is entitled, on a through bill of lading, to the benefit of the through toll to the point of delivery.

See Wylie Milling Co. *v.* Canadian Pacific and Kingston and Pembroke Railway Companies, 14 Can. Ry. Cas. 5.

The facts are fully set out in the judgment of Assistant Chief Commissioner Scott, January 16, 1915, 17 Can. Ry. Cas. 324.

STOLTZE MANUFACTURING CO. V. CANADIAN PACIFIC RAILWAY AND WESTERN CANADA POWER COMPANIES.

Application for joint tolls on shingles transported over the railways of the respondents.

The board refused to reduce the tolls on the respondent power company's line, on account of its extraordinary operating conditions, but made a reduction in the respondent railway company's toll by following the practice in Eastern Canada, where connecting carriers having no joint tolls each takes one cent from its local toll, subject to a minimum net toll.

Fullerton Lumber & Shingle Co. *v.* Canadian Pacific Railway Company, distinguished.

The facts are fully set out in the judgment of Assistant Chief Commissioner Scott, January 18, 1915, 17 Can. Ry. Cas., 282.

MOUNTAIN LUMBER MANUFACTURERS' ASSOCIATION V. CANADIAN PACIFIC RAILWAY COMPANY (GOLDEN TOLL CASE).

Application to direct the respondent to give Golden, on the main line of the Canadian Pacific Railway, the same tolls to all prairie destinations as now apply from Fernie on the Crowsnest branch, where the mileages are equal.

Held, that the tolls on lumber from Golden, on the main line of the Canadian Pacific railway, to prairie destinations, should be put on a parity with the tolls from corresponding points on the Crowsnest branch to the same destination via the same common point.

The facts are fully set out in the judgment of Chief Commissioner Drayton, February 9, 1915, 17 Can. Ry. Cas., 285.

BRITISH COLUMBIA CENTRAL FARMERS' INSTITUTES V. CANADIAN PACIFIC RAILWAY COMPANY.

Application for the privilege of shipping mixed carload lots of flour and feed, sacked and baled hay and straw, at carload tolls.

Held, that the provision in the railway company's tariffs west of lake Superior, that different commodities may be consolidated into carload lots at carload tolls, but when these commodities in such mixture take different ratings if shipped separately in straight carload lots, the entire mixed lot is charged the highest carload tolls and the highest minimum weight; (rule 2 (*c*)) follows the practically universal rule in freight classification and will not be disturbed by the board.

Judgment of Chief Commissioner Drayton, January 7, 1915, 17 Can. Ry. Cas., 431.

FREDERICTON BOARD OF TRADE V. CANADIAN PACIFIC RAILWAY COMPANY.

Application to direct the Canadian Pacific Railway Company to remedy arbitrary and unjustly discriminatory tolls on passenger traffic to and from Fredericton, N.B.

Held, that it is unjust discrimination for the respondent from considerations of traffic policy, to extend the advantage of the competitive toll to points where competition does not exist.

The facts are fully set out in the judgment of Mr. Commissioner McLean, July 18, 1914, 17 Can. Ry. Cas. 433.

Upon the application by the railway company for a rehearing, held, that under section 315, unjust discrimination does not exist where there is actual competition at the initial and terminal points reached by railway lines, and the potential choice of a passenger at an intermediate point whereby he may elect to buy a through ticket for the whole distance between the initial and terminal points, cheaper than one on a mileage basis from such intermediate point to the terminal point, spreads the effect of competitions over the whole journey.

The general scope of section 315 makes it clear that the board is empowered to recognize the existence of competition and its effects, therefore, when it is satisfied that such competition exists, it may allow a lower toll on the section of railway where the dissimilar circumstances and conditions created by such competitions exist.

Malkin & Sons *v.* Grand Trunk Railway Co. (Tan Bark Case) 8 Can. Ry Cas. 183, at pp. 186, 187; Almonte Knitting Co. *v.* Canadian Pacific and Michigan Central Railway Cos. (Almonte Knitting Co. Case), 3 Can. Ry. Cas. 441, followed.

Judgment, Mr. Commissioner McLean, January 7, 1915, 17 Can. Ry. Cas., 439.

APPEALS FROM DECISIONS OF THE BOARD.

For the year ending March 31, 1915, there were no appeals made to the Governor in Council from the decisions of the board. With regard to appeals to the Supreme Court of Canada during the same period, there were two appeals, the first being an appeal by the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway Company from the board's Order No. 19347, dated the 14th day of May, 1913, in respect of the company's station site at Prince George, B.C. This appeal was dismissed. The second appeal was that of the

Toronto Railway Company against the order of the board No. 22855, dated the 12th day of November, 1914, on certain questions of law involved. This appeal is still pending before the Supreme Court.

A list of the appeals from the board's decisions to the Supreme Court since its inception to date will be found under Appendix "K" to this report.

ORDERS, GENERAL ORDERS AND CIRCULARS.

The total number of orders issued for the year ending March 31, 1915, was 1,897. The number of general circulars issued by the board, directed to all railway companies subject to its jurisdiction for the year was nine. The general orders as distinguished from other orders issued by the board are those affecting all railway companies subject to the board's jurisdiction. A list of the general orders and circulars for the year ending March 31, 1915, will be found compiled under Appendix "L" to this report.

JUDGMENTS OF THE BOARD.

The principal judgments of the board delivered between the 1st of April, 1914, and the 31st of March, 1915, will be found under Appendix "C."

APPLICATIONS TO THE BOARD.

The total number of applications, including informal complaints made to the board, for the year ending March 31, 1915, was 4,050 (which shows a decrease from the preceding year of 1,516). Under Appendix "J" will be found a table classifying the applications and complaints made to the board under the various sections of the Railway Act. A detailed statement of these complaints, disposed of without a formal hearing, will be found under Appendix "A" to this report.

TRAFFIC DEPARTMENT OF THE BOARD.

In the traffic department of the board the number of tariffs received and filed for the year ending March 31, 1915, were as follows:—

Freight tariffs including supplements	70,738
Passenger tariffs including supplements	14,637
Express tariffs including supplements	3,664
Telephone tariffs including supplements	2,858
Sleeping and parlour car tariffs including supplements	97
Telegraph tariffs and supplements	23

This makes a total of 92,017 for the year, as compared with a previous total for the year ending March 31, 1914, of 94,086, being a decrease of 2,069 tariffs. It will be noted that the decrease occurs in the Express Tariffs and Supplements, which for the year ending March 31, 1914, were 9,817 as against 3,664 for the year ending March 31, 1915. The total number of tariffs filed from February 1, 1904, to March 31, 1915, was 581,092.

The details in regard to the tariffs will be found under Appendix "D" of this report.

ENGINEERING DEPARTMENT OF THE BOARD.

In the engineering department of the board a large number of inspections were made covering the whole Dominion. These inspections for the year ending March 31, 1915, number 390 and cover inspections for the opening of a railway for the carriage of traffic, as required under section 261 of the Railway Act, inspections of culverts, highway crossings, cattle guards, road crossings, bridges, subways and general inspections falling within the general scope of the work of the engineering department of the board.

For details of the various inspections made see Appendix "E."

SESSIONAL PAPER No. 20c

OPERATING DEPARTMENT OF THE BOARD.

Under the work of this department is included the inspection of locomotive boilers and their appurtenances, the inspection of safety appliances on cars and locomotives, the investigations into accidents causing personal injury or loss of life, the reporting on the locations of stations, matters of protection at highway crossings, and train and station service performed by the railway companies. Under Appendix "F" will be found a full and detailed report of the chief operating officer of the department.

ACCIDENTS AND ACCIDENT INVESTIGATIONS.

It will be noted that the comparative statement of killed and injured shows a marked decrease in the number of accidents among the passengers carried, railway employees, as well as others, as compared with the previous year 1913-14, but there still remains room for considerable improvement in this respect.

Among the casualties as represented by the figures given are a large number of accidents which occurred on highway crossings that are already protected either by gates or automatic bells, and in many instances the public disregard is evidenced in respect of the protective appliances supplied by persons crawling under the gates or walking around them, or endeavouring to cross the tracks in disregard of the alarm given by automatic signal bells. This appears to be peculiarly the case with drivers of automobiles who apparently depend upon the speed of the automobile to carry them across the tracks in front of a train, rather than wait a few moments to allow it to pass. It is suggested that automobile drivers shut off their machines when approaching level crossings of steam railways so that the alarm given by an automatic bell, or by an approaching train, might be more effectively heard. It is also highly desirable that the efforts and co-operation of railway employees and railway officials to reduce and eliminate accidents of all kinds be not in any measure released, but on the contrary increased wherever possible.

The following is a table giving comparisons between the total number of passengers carried by the railway companies, the number of passengers killed and injured, and the same information as to employees, and as to trespassers, showing the number of trespassers killed and the relative percentage thereof to the total number of persons killed for the year. The figures giving the total number of passengers and employees carried are for the year ending June 30, 1914, the last figures available.

Passengers—	
Number of passengers carried on railways	46,702,280
Number of passengers killed	8
Number of passengers injured	239
Employees—	
Number of employees with railways	159,142
Number of employees killed	99
Number of employees injured	873
Trespassers—	
Number of trespassers killed	170
Per cent of trespassers killed to total of 337	50

It will be noted that of what may be termed preventable loss, 170 killed under the heading of trespassers is a very large percentage of the total killed, and, as already stated in previous report, the board has through the attorney generals of the various provinces, taken up the question of prosecuting trespassers on railway property with a view to limiting the large number of fatalities which occur in this way; and, while the total number of trespassers killed for the year ending March 31, 1915, is considerably reduced from that of the previous year, there is still room for very considerable improvement in this respect.

The following table shows the totals by provinces as regards trespassers killed and injured for the year ending March 31, 1915:—

Provinces.	Killed.	Injured.
Ontario	90	69
Quebec	37	29
Manitoba	12	9
Saskatchewan	7	7
Alberta	8	8
British Columbia	16	12
Nova Scotia	nil	nil
New Brunswick	nil	1
Yukon	nil	nil
Total	170	126

FIRE INSPECTION DEPARTMENT OF THE BOARD.

The work of the fire inspection department continues to show steady growth, and co-operation with the various Dominion and provincial fire-protective organizations has been extended. During the past year 71 employees of such organizations were under appointment as officers of this department.

In connection with the condition of the railway companies' rights of way it is noted that a steady improvement has taken place and the fire hazard has been much reduced thereby. Attention has also been given by the companies to the fire hazard immediately adjacent to the companies' rights of way by piling and burning the debris on a narrow strip outside the right of way on both sides of the track. It might be noted here that in this work the respective Dominion and provincial governments or private owners are responsible, and vigorous action is needed on the part of such agencies in this connection.

Railway companies operating through forest sections have been required to maintain special fire patrols in order to prevent fires along their right of way. Supplementing this action special instructions relative to the reporting and extinguishing of fires have been issued by the various railway companies to all their employees, and it is gratifying to note that excellent results have been obtained.

During the season of 1914 a total of 12,799 miles of fire guards were constructed by the Canadian Pacific, Canadian Northern, Grand Trunk Pacific and Great Northern railways, under the requirements prescribed by the chief fire inspector. These requirements were practically the same as those prescribed in 1913.

It may be noted that oil as a locomotive fuel is in exclusive use on a total of 726 miles of railway lines in British Columbia, and it is anticipated that this will be doubled during the ensuing year by the installation of oil fuel on the Grand Trunk Pacific railway between Prince Rupert, B.C., and Jasper, Alta., a distance of 718 miles. There have been no instances of fire caused by oil burning in Canada.

A condition of unusually severe drought obtained during the spring and summer season of 1914, which resulted in a fire loss throughout the country that has been the greatest since 1910, despite the effort of greatly improved fire-protective organizations.

A total of 1,346 fires are reported as having started within 300 feet of the railway track, throughout the Dominion, during the fire season of 1914. These fires burned over a total area of 191,770 acres, of which 49,326 acres, or 25·72 per cent was young forest growth and 107,496, or 56·05 per cent, merchantable timber, the balance of the area burned over being grass or cultivated land and slashing or old burn not restocking. The total value of property destroyed by the above fires was $453,442, of which $202,987 was for merchantable timber and $59,624 was the estimated value of young forest growth destroyed. Of the above 1,346 fires, 904 or 67·16 per cent were reported as having been caused by railway agencies. One hundred and thirty-seven fires are reported as due to tramps, camp fires, etc., 62 fires as due to settlers clearing land and 16 to other known causes. There were 227 fires reported as of unknown origin.

ROUTINE WORK OF THE BOARD.

RECORD DEPARTMENT.

Since the publication of the last annual report there has been no change in connection with the clerical staff of this department, with the exception of that caused by the death of Mr. C. S. Huband, acting record officer of the board, who died after a lengthy illness on November 25, 1914. The board has not deemed it necessary under existing circumstances to fill the vacancy caused by Mr. Huband's death.

Below is given a table setting forth the number of applications, filings and letters received during the year ending March 31, 1915, together with the number of orders issued.

Number of applications made	4,050
Number of filings received during the year	43,966
Number of outgoing letters during year	39,302
Number of orders issued during the year	1,897

Under Appendix "A" will be found the list of informal complaints made during the year, and under Appendix "J" will be found table showing the applications, complaints, etc., classified under the various sections of the Railway Act as compiled by Mr. F. R. Demers, clerk in charge of the statistical branch of the record room.

Under Appendix "K" will be found the list of cases appealed to the Supreme Court and to the Governor in Council since the 1st of February, 1904.

SECRETARY'S DEPARTMENT.

Since the publication of the last Annual Report of the Board, Mr. R. Richardson was, by Order in Council dated November 7, 1914, appointed Assistant Secretary to the Board, being transferred from the office of the Chief Commissioner. Mr. Richardson was first appointed to the staff of the Board by Order in Council dated April 5, 1905, as Private Secretary to the then Chief Commissioner, and shortly after that date he was appointed by the Board as Acting Secretary outside of Ottawa, covering not only the Maritime and Eastern Provinces but also the Province of Manitoba and the western provinces. It is to be noted that during the ten years that have elapsed since Mr. Richardson's first appointment he has discharged his duties as Acting Secretary in a manner highly satisfactory to the Board.

The vacancy created in the Chief Commissioner's office by the transfer of Mr. Richardson to the Secretary's Department, has been filled by the transfer and appointment of Mr. C. M. B. Chapman from the Traffic Department to the position of Private Secretary to the Chief Commissioner.

APPENDIX "A."

LIST OF COMPLAINTS FILED WITH THE BOARD OF RAILWAY COMMISSIONERS, YEAR ENDING MARCH 31, 1915.

4798. The Grand Trunk Railway Company making a charge of twelve dollars per year against a telephone company for the privilege of installing a telephone in the Grand Trunk Railway Company's station at Newton, Ont.

4799. Alleged excessive freight rates charged by the Canadian Pacific Railway Company on shipments of sand and gravel from St. Gabriel de Brandon, P.Q.

4800. Lack of proper cattleguards on the Canadian Pacific Railway Company's right of way in the vicinity of Churchbridge, Sask.

4801. Unsatisfactory drainage facilities on the Toronto, Hamilton and Buffalo Railway at Hamilton, Ont.

4802. The Canadian Northern Railway Company assessing an annual rental for use of steel on siding constructed by the complainants in the parish of St. Alexis, P.Q.

4803. Difficulty experienced by complainant in collecting payments from the Canadian Northern Railway Company in connection with a townsite agreement at Cardale, Man.

4804. Unsatisfactory train connections at Orillia, Ont., by the Grand Trunk Railway Company's trains.

4805. Refusal of the Grand Trunk Railway Company to pay damages to complainant for inconvenience caused by the moving of his farm road near Trenton, Ont.

4806. Lack of proper cattle guards on the Canadian Northern Railway Company's right of way in the vicinity of Giroux, Man.

4807. Alleged overcharge on a shipment of live stock handled by the Canadian Pacific Railway Company between Broomhill, Man. and Coleville, Sask.

4808. The Canadian Pacific Railway Company charging a higher rate for handling stone between St. Marys and Berlin, Ont., than the Grand Trunk Railway Company charge for handling this same commodity over their line.

4809. Refusal of contractors on the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway to pay complainant for services performed in the construction of the line.

4810. Refusal of the Grand Trunk Railway Company to settle with complainant for wheat lost in transit due to leakage from cars between Goderich, Ont., and Ingersoll, Ont.

4811. Refusal of the Canadian Pacific Railway Company to furnish a rebate on unused portion of ticket covering passage between Herbert, Sask., and New York, N.Y., which was only used to Montreal, Que.

4812. Delay in transit to shipment of furs from Sturgeon Falls, Ont., to Corry, Penn., via Dominion Express and Wells Fargo Express Companies.

4813. Delay of the Dominion Express Company and the Wells Fargo Express Company in handling a shipment of furs from St. Catharines, Ont., to Corry, Penn.

4814. The Canadian Northern Railway Company raising switching rates at Trenton, Ont., covering shipments of canned apples to Grand Trunk Railway Company's lines.

4815. Refusal of the Canadian Northern Railway Company to grant remuneration to complainant for deterioration in value of his land on account of their lines being constructed through same in the vicinity of Excel, Alta.

4816. Alleged discrimination shown by the Canadian Pacific Railway Company in connection with freight rates on line from Owen Sound to Sault Ste. Marie, Ont.; also against the 40,000 pound minimum carload weight.

4817. Joint rates on shipments of lumber and lath charged by the Intercolonial Railway to points on the Canadian Pacific Railway as compared with rates on the same commodity to points on the Grand Trunk Railway.

4818. Unsatisfactory treatment received at the hands of the Canadian Northern Railway Company in connection with the construction of a gravel pit siding across property of complainant in the vicinity of Billings Bridge, Ont.

4819. The Canadian Pacific Railway Company's delay in settling for land expropriated from settlers for right of way purposes in the vicinity of Monitor, Alta.

4820. Alleged excessive storage charges assessed by the Canadian Pacific Railway Company on a piano stored at Moosejaw, Sask.

4821. The railway companies discontinuing summer freight rates between Montreal and Ottawa, Ont., and various other points.

4822. Unsatisfactory station accommodation provided by the Canadian Northern Railway at Alsask, Sask.

4823. Alleged discrimination shown by the British Columbia Electric Railway Company against the District of Collingwood, B.C., in the matter of passenger fares.

4824. Alleged excessive passenger fares charged on the Montreal and Southern Counties Railway between Longueuil and St. Lambert and between Chambly and St. Lambert, P.Q.

4825. Refusal of the Grand Trunk Railway Company to operate on complainant's siding at St. Marys, Ont., until settlement is made of an account for repairs to said siding which were made previous to the time siding agreement was made between the railway company and complainant.

4826. The Canadian Northern Railway Company removing dirt for filling purposes from land of complainant and refusing to pay for same; also unsatisfactory condition of a fence along the right of way of the Canadian Northern Railway Company's Humboldt to Calgary branch.

4827. Delay of the Canadian Pacific Railway Company in making settlement of claims for lost merchandise and the late delivery of goods.

4828. The Canadian Pacific Railway Company charging a ten cent fare between Lumsdens Mills and Timiskaming, P.Q.

4829. Refusal of the Canadian Northern Railway Company to furnish complainant with an extra farm crossing in lot 40, concession 9, township of Ross, Ont., and to furnish him with cattle guards at his crossing.

4830. Delay of the Dominion Express Company in handling a shipment of furs from Port Dover, Ont., to Corry, Penn.

4831. Delay of the Canadian Pacific Railway Company in making settlement for land taken on their Weyburn-Lethbridge branch in section 21, township 6, range 22, west of the third meridian.

4832. Alleged excessive freight rates charged on shipments of artistic and fancy building brick shipped from points in Pennsylvania and Ohio to Montreal, P.Q.

4833. Refusal of the Bell Telephone Company to give long distance service connections with an independent telephone company at Riverfield, P.Q.

4834. Unsatisfactory minimum weight of carload shipments of pulpwood required in the Bangor and Aroostook Railroad tariff No. C.R.C. 125, I.C.C. 1040.

4835. Alleged excessive freight charges on a car of lumber shipped from Vancouver, B.C., to Benton, Alta., on the Canadian Pacific Railway.

4836. Unsatisfactory condition of fences and cattle guards on the Canadian Pacific Railway for several miles on both sides of the Columbia river, B.C.

4837. Alleged unjustifiable advance in cartage charges on caskets in the city of Winnipeg, Man.

4838. Alleged overcharge assessed by the Canadian Northern Railway Company on the shipment of a separator from Oak River to McGee, Sask.

4839. Loss of dishes in transit over the Canadian Pacific Railway between Armstrong, B.C., to Hamilton, Ont.

4840. The Hydro-Electric Power Commission erecting a high power transmission line over the tracks of the Lake Erie and Northern Railway between Brantford, Ont., and Paris, Ont., and their refusal to remove a pole which interferes with the railway company's grading and drainage.

4841. Unsatisfactory Canadian freight classification on mahogany.

4842. Unsatisfactory valuation given by the Canadian Pacific Railway Company's valuators on stock and grain damages in the vicinity of Bridesville, B.C.

4843. Alleged excessive charges assessed by the Canadian Northern Railway Company for the carriage of cattle in less than carload lots.

4844. Alleged unfair treatment received at the hands of the Canadian Pacific Railway Company in connection with horses and cattle killed on their right of way in the vicinity of Lower Nicola, B.C.

4845. Lack of cattle guards at railway crossing on the Canadian Northern Railway, in the vicinity of Manville, Alta., in winter.

4846. Alleged excessive charges of the Bell Telephone Company for the insertion of extra names in their telephone directory in the city of Montreal, P.Q.

4847. Refusal of the Esquimalt and Nanaimo Railway Company to install cattle guards at farm crossing one mile north of Tyee Siding, B.C.

4848. Excessive charges of express companies for carrying deceased persons in caskets.

4849. Unsatisfactory routing given to a parcel of furs shipped via the American Express Company from Shedden, Ont., to Corry, Penn.

4850. Refusal of the Canadian Express Company to reimburse complainant for goods broken or damaged in transit from Brantford, Ont.

4851. Unsafe condition of fencing on the Central Ontario Railway, about half a mile above Glen Ross, Ont.,

4852. Refusal of the Canadian Northern Railway Company to make any settlement of claims for stock killed by trains on their right of way in the vicinity of Prince Albert, Sask.

4853. Freight rates charged on caustic soda and bleaching powders in carload lots on Canadian railways.

4854. Unsatisfactory condition of culvert on the Esquimalt and Nanaimo Railway, on the property of complainant near Cowichan, B.C.

4855. Alleged discrimination shown by the Canadian Pacific Railway Company with regard to freight rates on grain and mill feeds imported into the Cowichan district, B.C.

4856. Refusal of the Canadian Pacific Railway Company to settle claim for case of eggs lost in transit between Cowichan, B.C., and Sechelt, B.C.

4857. Embargo enforced by the Galt, Preston and Hespeler Railway Company in conjunction with the Canadian Pacific Railway Company on cars of freight over the Grand Trunk Railway consigned to team tracks on the Galt, Preston and Hespeler Railway.

4858. Refusal of the Canadian Pacific Railway Company to settle a claim for damages on account of a telegram being marked as originating at Vancouver, B.C., instead of Arlington, Wash.

4859. Refusal of the Canadian Northern Express Company to settle a claim for poultry which died in transit from Prince Albert, Sask., to Saskatoon, Sask.

4860. Unsatisfactory classification given in Canadian freight classification to tungsten lamps.

4861. Refusal of the Dominion Express Company to entertain claim for bananas frozen in transit between Winnipeg, Man., and Toulon, Man.

4862. Damage to hay by fire from engines of the Canadian Northern Railway Company near Midale, Sask.

4863. Fire damage to pasture lands near Hayter, Alta., caused by sparks from Canadian Pacific Railway Company' engines.

4864. Refusal of the Canadian Pacific Railway Company to make refund of difference between rates charged by construction gangs carrying freight and the regular grain rates on shipments handled between Torquay and Fort William, Ont., and Outram and Fort William, Ont.

4865. The Grand Trunk Railway Company increasing switching rate on the town spur in violation of agreement made with the village of Fergus, Ont.

4866. The Great Northern Railway Company charging a passenger rate of four cents a mile on the Canadian side of the border whereas they are only permitted by law to charge two cents per mile on the United States side.

4867. Unsatisfactory train service provided by the Canadian Pacific Railway Company between Lac du Bonnet, Man., and Winnipeg, Man.

4868. Inability of Complainant to obtain settlement from the Canadian Pacific Railway Company for oak table lost in transit between Ste. Agathe des Monts, P.Q., and Bromptonville, Que.

4869. Delay of the Canadian Northern Railway Company in paying for twenty loads of manure purchased at Delmas, Sask.

4870. Unsatisfactory train service on the Kootenay Valley Railway operated by the Great Northern Railway Company.

4871. Refusal of the Canadian Pacific Railway Company to make compensation for cow killed on right of way near Coleman, Alta., due to defective cattle guards.

4872. Damage to crops in the vicinity of Davis, Sask., due to fires from Canadian Northern Railway Company's engines.

4873. Lack of station agent at Elcott, Sask., on the Regina-Boundary branch of the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway.

4874. Overcrowding of cars on the Burnaby Lake branch of the British Columbia Electric Railway.

4875. Practice of Canadian Railways in holding back settlements of claims for periods of from four to eight months.

4876. Excessive freight charges on automobiles handled between British Columbia and Vancouver Island.

4877. Interswitching rates on coal at Trenton, Ont., between the Central Ontario and Grand Trunk Railways.

4878. Canadian Freight Classification on Ruberoid, Cronolite, Kaloroid, Dominion and Eureka roofings and roofing materials.

4879. Alleged excessive freight rate charged on a shipment of lumber from Rydlebank on the Northern Ontario and Lake Huron Railway to Bruce station on the Canadian Pacific Railway.

4880. Unsatisfactory method of handling passengers on mixed trains at divisional points which requires that passengers must travel through yards and across tracks to get to their coach.

4881. Refusal of the Hull Electric Railway Company to grant reduced fares between Aylmer, P.Q., and Ottawa, Ont., at certain hours of the day.

4882. Unsatisfactory treatment received from the Atlantic Quebec and Western Railway Company in connection with drainage and the matter of a farm crossing at Little Pabos, P.Q.

4883. Refusal of the Canadian Pacific Railway Company to make settlement for colt killed on their right-of-way on the Regina-Colonsay branch.

4884. Inability of complainant to get coal shed and siding accommodation from the Canadian Northern Railway Company at Calgary, Alta.

4885. Refusal of the Canadian Pacific Railway Company to entertain claim for apples frozen in transit to Maple Creek, Sask.

4886. Unsatisfactory rates covering carload shipments of milk at Vancouver, B.C.

4887. Alleged excessive freight rates charged on shipment of a car of hogs from Millett, Alta., to North Edmonton, Alta., via Canadian Pacific, Canadian Northern and Grand Trunk Pacific Railways.

4888. Freight rate charged by the Canadian Pacific Railway Company on a shipment of well drilling machinery shipped from Corsicans, Texas to Strathcona, Alta.

4889. Alleged unsafe operation of trains in the vicinity of Edmonton, Alta., on the Canadian Pacific Railway.

4890. Unsatisfactory drainage from property of the Atlantic, Quebec and Western Railway Company at Petite Riviere Est, P.Q.

4891. Trestle on the Atlantic, Quebec and Western Railway which causes highway on their right of way to be blocked with snow at Brèche à Manon, P. Q.

4892. Lack of fencing on the Canadian Northern Railway Rosebury Branch in the vicinity of Sandy Lake, Man.

4893. Alleged refusal of the Canadian Pacific Railway Company to sell seats in sleeping cars after 10 p.m., and refusing accommodation in these cars unless a berth is purchased.

4894. Damage caused by spark from Canadian Northern Railway Company's engine at Munson, Alta.

4895. Refusal of the Canadian Pacific Railway Company to make settlement of claim which originated on account of delay in transit of shipment from Cincinnati, U.S.A., to Vancouver, B.C.

4896. Alleged excessive express rates on carload shipments of fresh fish from Vancouver, B.C., to Winnipeg, Man.

4897. Damage done to steam and water pipes in the Institution for the Blind at Brantford, Ont., by means of electrolysis caused by improper bonding of the rails of the Grand Valley Railway Company.

4898. Alleged excessive freight rates charged on a car of mill stuff from a milling company at Lethbridge, Alta., to Crawford Bay, B.C., over the Canadian Pacific Railway.

4899. Blocking of culvert on the Canadian Pacific Railway east of Isbester, Ont.

4900. Proposed closing of highway crossing between sections 2 and 11, west of the second meridian, at Invermay, Sask., on the Canadian Northern Railway.

4901. Damage by fire caused from sparks from Canadian Northern Railway Company's engines at Birch Hills, Sask.

4902. The Canadian Northern Railway ploughing fire guards on private property at Delia, Alta.

4903. Loss of cattle on account of fire which originated from sparks from Canadian Northern Railway Company's engines near Standard, Alta.

4904. Damage to property caused by fire from Canadian Northern Railway Company's engines near Hanna, Alta.

4905. Refusal of the Dominion Atlantic Railway Company to furnish a crossing at an approach to private property at Deed Brook, N.S.

4906. Alleged excessive express charges assessed on parcels shipped from Brandon, Man., via Canadian Northern Express Company to London, England.

4907. Lack of proper fencing along the right of way of the Michigan Central Railway Company at Edy's Mills, Ont.

4908. Unsatisfactory condition of roadway at highway crossing over the tracks of the Lake Erie and Northern Railway Company between concessions 11 and 12, township of Townsend, Ont.

4909. Unsatisfactory express delivery limits in the town of St. Jerome, P.Q.

4910. The closing of a farm crossing at Foster, P.Q., on the Canadian Pacific Railway.

4911. Alleged discrimination against the city of Fort William, Ont. in the matter of freight rates as compared with all other points in western Canada.

4912. Refusal of the Canadian Pacific Railway Company's agent at Eagle River, Ont., to stop the second section of a train for a passenger wishing to board same.

4913. Bad state of roads in the immediate vicinity of the Canadian Northern Railway Company's station at St. Ursule, P.Q.

4914. Dangerous condition of Grand Trunk Railway Company's crossing at seventh concession line, one-half mile west of Georgetown, Ont.

4915. Refusal of the Canadian Pacific Railway Company to build a spur line extension for the accommodation of complainant at Waldo, B.C.

4916. The proposed discontinuance of daily passenger and mail train service between Midway and Nelson, B.C., on the Canadian Pacific Railway.

4917. Alleged excessive freight rates charged on corn handled over the Michigan Central Railway.

4918. Smoke nuisance and noise of trains along the river front in the town of Walkerville, Ont.

4919. Inability of complainant to get a settlement with the Grand Trunk Railway Company for furniture damaged in transit from West Toronto, Ont., to Windsor, Ont.

4920. Delay of the Canadian Pacific Railway Company for right of way purposes in the southeast quarter of section 21, township 17, range 7, west of the third meridian.

4921. Alleged unjust dismissal, by the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway Company, of a sectionman employed on the Regina boundary branch.

4922. Lack of proper fencing along the right of way of the Canadian Pacific Railway through a number of Indian Reserves such as Spuzzum, Boston Bar and North Bend and the resultant loss in cattle, horses, etc. being killed.

4923. Delay of the Canadian Pacific Railway Company in paying for land expropriated for right of way purposes near Marcelin, Sask., in the southeast quarter of section 26, township 44, range 7, west of the third meridian.

4924. Canadian freight classification for wheels of sheaf loaders.

4925. Refusal of the Canadian Northern Ontario Railway Company to settle claim for horse killed at Bowmanville, Ont.

4926. Alleged excessive freight charges assessed by the Canadian Pacific Railway Company on a shipment handled between Hughenden, Alta., and Toronto, Ont.

4927. The curtailment of freight and mail service between Selkirk, Man., and Gimli, Man., on the Winnipeg Beach branch of the Canadian Pacific Railway.

4928. The Canadian Northern Ontario Railway Company tearing up planking at farm crossing and digging a deep ditch on both sides of the track at Bowmanville, Ont.

4929. Condition of the Canadian Northern Railway Company's fencing at Bowmanville, Ont.

4930. Alleged excessive freight rates charged on a shipment of cotton goods from Magog, P.Q., to Walkerville, Ont., over the Canadian Pacific and Pere Marquette railways.

4931. Alleged overcharge on a car of mixed lumber shipped over the Canadian Pacific Railway from Fruitvale, B.C., to Calgary, Alta.

4932. Refusal of the Canadian Northern Railway Company to install a station agent at Banning, Ont.

4933. The Boston and Maine Railway Company not giving reduced rates in connection with the transportation of registered livestock, while all other railways grant half rate.

4934. Refusal of the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway Company to give a coal shed site at Keystown, Sask.

4935. Refusal of the Byron Telephone Company to give subscriber connection with London, Ont., on the line of the United Telephone Company of Lobo township, Ont.

4936. Dangerous crossing of the Esquimalt and Nanaimo Railway over the Victoria and Campbell River road, south of station in Duncan, B.C.

4937. Blocking of crossing known as the gravel road, in the Township of Yarmouth, Ont., by the Pere Marquette Railway Company's shunting operations, thus violating order of the board No. 13930.

4938. Damage to property of complainant living in the vicinity of Trenton, Ont., due to the Canadian Northern Ontario Railway Company constructing through his farm.

4939. Canadian freight classification of "Roemac" a road construction material.

4940. Inability of the Canadian Pacific Railway Company to furnish anything smaller than an 80,000-pound capacity car for a tail end shipment of wheat and assessing a charge as if the car was filled to capacity.

4941. Failure of the Quebec, Montreal and Southern Railway Company to provide farm crossing for complainant at La Baie, Que.

4942. Delay of Canadian Railway Companies in adjusting claims, delays in shipments, damages, etc.

4943. Refusal of the Bell Telephone Company to give connection with an independent rural telephone company in Hullett township, Ont.

4944. Unsatisfactory condition of fences along the Grand Trunk Railway near Argyle, Ont.

4945. Unsatisfactory train and mail service to and from Neville, Sask., on the Swift Current Southeasterly branch of the Canadian Pacific Railway.

4946. Shortage in weight of shipments of coal handled from Taber, Lethbridge, Alta., and other Western points to Weyburn, Sask., for which complainant is unable to obtain reimbursement.

4947. Lack of facilities for loading stock at Landis, Sask., on the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway.

4948. Refusal of the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway Company to settle claim for stock killed on right of way of their Tofield-Calgary branch.

4949. Unsatisfactory condition of the Canadian Pacific Railway Company's station at St. Felix de Valois, P.Q.

4950. Unsafe condition of some six or eight level crossings on the Sydney and Louisburg Railway in the town of Glace Bay, N.S.

4951. The Dominion Power and Transmission Company constructing a fence between their right of way and public highway at Burlington, Ont., and the inconvenience caused to a complainant by the gates constructed at his property.

4952. Damage to property caused by the construction of a spur track belonging to the Canadian Northern Railway Company in the southwest quarter of section 35, township 50, range 6, west of the fourth meridian.

4953. Alleged excessive freight charges assessed by the Atlantic, Quebec and Western Railway Company on a box of books shipped from Midland, Ont., to Newport Centre, P.Q.

4954. Train service to and from Belle Plaine, Sask., on the Canadian Pacific Railway.

4955. Refusal of the Atlantic, Quebec and Western Railway Company to install siding to handle local business at Chandler, P.Q.

4956. Dangerous condition of highway crossing at Mile 26·97 on the Campbellford, Lake Ontario and Western Railway in the village of Parham, Ont.

4957. Proposed location of a spur track from the Canadian Northern Ontario Railway to run between River and Wakefield streets in Parry Sound, Ont.

4958. Alleged excessive freight charges assessed by the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway on two cars of cordwood from Buckland, Sask., to Loverna, Sask.

4959. Refusal of the Pere Marquette Railway Company to accept shipments of hogs for delivery in Buffalo, N.Y.

4960. Delay of the Grand Trunk Railway Company in settling claim for money lost in transit from Hagersville, Ont., to Morrin, Alta.

4961. Lack of a proper crossing where the Canadian Northern Railway crosses road allowance between sections 28 and 29, township 19, range 22, west of the second meridian, in the rural municipality of Lumsden, Sask.

4962. Dangerous crossing over the Canadian Pacific Railway Company's Alberta Central branch of the provincial government's surveyed road into the village of Rocky Mountain House, Alta.

4963. Proposed change in timetable on the Canadian Northern Ontario Railway Company's Ironsdale-Bancroft line and Central Ontario line.

4964. That bridge over waterway at Kenora, Ont., which is controlled by the Rat Portage Lumber Company and the Canadian Pacific Railway Company is interfering with navigation of said waterway.

4965. Damage to property at lot 40, concession 9, township of Camden, Ont., caused by dislodgment of a large stone which was thrown onto said property during the construction work of the Campbellford, Lake Ontario and Western Railway Company at that point.

4966. Excessive switching charges assessed by the Canadian Pacific Railway Company for switching services at Redcliff, Alta.

4967. The Quebec Oriental Railway Company charging excess on commercial travellers' baggage handled from station to station.

4968. The Canadian Northern Railway Company's highway crossing in the municipality of Whitehead, Man., being both dangerous and below standard.

4969. Proposed change in Supplement 26, Tariff 2866 relative to Grand Trunk Pacific Railway switching to North Edmonton, Alta.

4970. Passengers standing in cars and on running boards of cars on the Niagara Gorge route of the Niagara Gorge Railway.

4971. Refusal of the Toronto, Hamilton, and Buffalo Railway Company to take milk or express matter on the morning train at either St. Anns or Smithville, Ont.

4972. Refusal of the Canadian Pacific Railway Company to grant compensation for buildings which are in danger of being burned down on account of being so close to the Moosejaw-Lacombe branch near Ethmuir, Sask.

4973. Delay of the Canadian Northern Railway Company in settling for right of way through the northeast quarter of section 32, township 26, range 13, west of the third meridian, in the vicinity of Forgan, Sask.

4974. Lack of proper drainage on the Canadian Northern Railway Company's right of way at highway just southeast of station at Innisfree, Alta.

4975. Train service and connections with the Canadian Pacific Railway at Sudbury, Ont.

4976. Overcrowding of cars on the Great Northern Railway week-end trains and also relative to matter of passengers being locked in cars on arrival at their destination.

4977. Canadian freight classification of glauber salts and sal soda.

4978. Present method of computing storage charges on parcels shipped from long distances.

4979. The Hydro Electric Power Commission of Ontario constructing a power wire over the Canadian Pacific Railway at Menoset station, Ont.

4980. Unsatisfactory condition of approach to crossing over the Calgary and Edmonton Railway in the rural municipality of Mountain View, Man.

4981. Excessive charges assessed by the Canadian Pacific Railway Company on a car of live stock shipped from Calgary, Alta., to Grand Forks, B.C., and failure of that company to water the live stock as required by the twenty-four hour law.

4982. Dangerous condition of highway crossing on the Grand Trunk Railway at one and a quarter miles east of Burlington Junction, Ont.

4983. Unsatisfactory train service on the Vegreville branch of the Canadian Northern Railway Company and delay in getting cream shipments to Edmonton, Alta., on account of such train service.

4984. The Grand Trunk Pacific Railway Company charging a fixed rate from Regina, Sask., to Lebret, Sask., which includes a twenty-five cent entrance fee to sport grounds at Lebret, Sask., on an excursion handled for the Carmichael Sunday school.

4985. Alleged discrimination shown by the Canadian Express Company in the matter of delivery of parcels at Lakefield, Ont.

4986. Unsatisfactory condition of culvert belonging to the Canadian Pacific Railway Company which interferes with the use of an undercrossing in the township of Pickering, Ont.

4987. Location of signal lights and other lights on the Pere Marquette Railway and obstructions that interfere with a clear view to these lights west of St. Thomas, Ont.

4988. Stock being killed on the right of way of the Canadian Pacific Railway on the north fork of the Kettle river, north of Grand Forks, B.C.

4989. Loading platform at Boissevain, Man., being unsatisfactory so far as accommodation is concerned.

4990. Unsatisfactory location of the Canadian Northern Railway Company's station at Ethelbert, Man.

4991. Refusal of the Canadian Pacific Railway Company to settle claim for bacon and ham stolen from the freight shed at Mara, B.C.

4992. Lack of proper fencing along a ballast pit on the property of complainant near Hughenden, Alta., on the line of the Canadian Pacific Railway Company.

4993. Delay of the Kettle Valley Railway Company in settling for lands expropriated for right of way purposes on their line between Osprey Lake and Princeton, B.C.

4994. Unsatisfactory train service on the Virden to McAuley branch of the Canadian Pacific Railway Company in Manitoba.

4995. The Quebec Central and Boston and Maine Railway Companies cutting off pullman accommodation between Sherbrooke, Que., and Boston, Me., during the summer season.

4996. Proposed location of the Canadian Northern Railway Company's station near Stonefield, Que., and lack of a highway leading to the station if it is placed as proposed.

4997. The Eastern Canada Passenger Association raising the minimum of passengers to which reduced rates will be granted in connection with conventions, representative meetings, etc.

4998. Alleged excessive freight charges on a car of settlers' effects shipped from Pierson, Man., to Langham, Sask., over the Canadian Pacific and Canadian Northern Railway lines.

4999. Lack of station facilities for loading or unloading baggage or merchandise at Glasnevin, Sask., on the Weyburn-Lethbridge branch of the Canadian Pacific Railway Company.

5000. The Bell Telephone Company raising rates at Montreal, Que., on the basis per mile of wire instead of actual distance between points.

5001. Proposed diversion of Mill creek, Galt, Ont., as shown on the plans of the Lake Erie and Northern Railway Company for revised location through Galt, Ont.

5002. Alleged improper charge assessed by the Canadian Northern Railway Company at Toronto, Ont., covering shipments of coal diverted to points on their line.

5003. The Canadian Pacific Railway Company filling an open drain which drained the back of complainant's farm in the township of Trafalgar, Ont.; also putting gravel on a highway crossing the tracks at that point.

5004. Refusal of the Irondale, Bancroft and Ottawa Railway Company to construct a farm crossing over their line near Harcourt, Ont.

5005. Lack of proper fencing along the right of way of the Grand Trunk Railway Company at London, Ont.

5006. The culverts on the Morinville branch of the Canadian Northern Railway being too small to carry off the water from the district in the vicinity of St. Albert, Alta.

5007. The culverts on the Edmonton, Dunvegan and British Columbia Railway being too small and too high to properly drain the district near St. Albert, Alta.

5008, Lack of lavatory and facilities for handling freight at Fruitvale Station, B.C., on the Great Northern Railway.

5009. Refusal of the Canadian Pacific Railway Company to settle claim for goods lost in transit from Kinley, Sask., to Rockhaven, Sask.

5010. Unsatisfactory treatment received by complainant from the Canadian Pacific Railway Company in connection with sale of land for right of way purposes in the southwest quarter of section 20, township 34, range 2, west of the fourth meridian, near Wilhelmina, Alta.

5011. Condition of the Grand Trunk Railway Company's roadbed between Parry Sound and Depot Harbour, Ont.

5012. Alleged excessive demurrage charges assessed by the Canadian Pacific Railway Company on a car held at Vancouver, B.C.

5013. The Bell Telephone Company in the city of Montreal, P.Q., raising the telephone rates on a basis of the distance to the telephone exchange from the subscriber.

5014. Unsatisfactory condition of fences along the right of way of the Grand Trunk Railway at Maple Lake, Ont.

5015. Freight rates on the Vancouver, Victoria and Eastern Railway between Fernridge, B.C., and Sumas, Washington.

5016. Lack of proper drainage system at creek which crosses the Canadian Pacific Railway at Amyot, Ont.

5017. Canadian Pacific Railway Company's conductor charging complainant extra fare from Toronto, Ont., to London, Ont., when he presented a ticket reading from Neudorf, Sask., to London, Ont.

5018. Alleged discrimination shown in the matter of rates against the city of Saskatoon, Sask., and in favour of Battleford, Sask., on the Lovernia Branch of the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway Company.

5019. Unsatisfactory mail train service to and from Redcliffe, Alta., on the Canadian Pacific Railway.

5020. Refusal of the Canadian Northern Railway Company to put a crossing over their track at Hale, B.C., on the Government road which is constructed from Grand Forks, B.C., to Phœnix, B.C.

5021. Charges asked by the Bell Telephone Company for connection with their telephone line and the South Drummond telephone line at Perth, Ont.

5022. Dangerous crossing at Dorval, P.Q., over the lines of the Canadian Pacific Railway and the Grand Trunk Railway.

5023. The unsatisfactory condition of the Canadian Pacific Railway Company's crossings in the rural municipality of Cory, Sask.

5024. Condition of the Canadian Northern Railway Company's crossings in the rural municipality of Cory No. 344, Sask.

5025. Alleged excessive overcharge on a shipment of oats from Irricanna to Calgary, Alta. over the Canadian Pacific Railway.

5026. Refusal of the Canadian Pacific Railway Company to entertain claim for refund of overcharge on a shipment of lumber from South Wellington, B.C., to Merritt, B.C.

5027. Unsatisfactory facilities provided by the Canadian Express Company for the shipment of perishable fruits from Jordon, Ont.

5028. Dangerous condition of highway crossings on the line of the Canadian Pacific Railway Company between Sagwa and St. John, N.B.

5029. Refusal of the Canadian Northern Railway Company to put a highway crossing over the side track east of the depot at Pelly, Sask.

5030. The passenger fares charged on the Canadian Pacific Railway between St. Gabriel de Brandon, Que., and Joliette, Que.

5031. Dangerous level crossing on the Canadian Pacific Railway at Westfield cutting between Westfield, N.B., and Hillandale, N.B.

5032. Dangerous level crossing on the Canadian Pacific Railway at Martinon Station, N.B.

5033. Dangerous level crossing on the Canadian Pacific Railway at Ketepec Station, N.B.

5034. Dangerous level crossing on the Canadian Pacific Railway between Ketepec and Acamac, N.B.

5035. The Grand Trunk Railway Company changing the name of Stanfold Station, Que., to Princeville, Que.

5036. Delay of the Canadian Pacific Railway Company in making refund for overcharge in passenger fare on a trip from Woodlawn Station on the Michigan Central Railway to Montreal, Que., via Smiths Falls, Ont., with stopover at Chesterville, Ont.

5037. The Grand Trunk Railway Company delivering carload consignments of cement to the Northern Navigation Company's boats at Owen Sound, Ont., without assessing the dockage charges.

5038. The Canadian Pacific Railway Company assessing an interline switching charge against a Vancouver firm on cars which are switched to elevator for storage but not consigned to the complainants.

5039. Refusal of the Grand Trunk Railway Company to entertain claim for a Columbia Multiple Battery which was destroyed while in transit from Cleveland, Ohio, to Blandford, N.S.

5040. The Bell Telephone Company at Montreal, Que., charging a commercial rate for telephone installed in residence at Notre Dame de Grace, Montreal, Que.

5041. The Grand Trunk Pacific Railway Company expropriating a strip of land four hundred feet wide through homestead in the northwest quarter of section 14, township 53, west of the fifth meridian near Gainford, Alta.

5042. Refusal of the Bell Telephone Company to install a telephone on premises of complainant in the city of Montreal, Que.

5043. Poor service of the Canadian Northern Express Company between Bancroft, Ont., and Toronto, Ont.

5044. The Canadian Pacific Railway Company's agent selling a ticket to Sturgeon Falls, Ont., and directing passenger to a train which was not supposed to stop there although passenger found out after he had alighted at North Bay, Ont., that this train did stop at Sturgeon Falls for mail.

5045. Unsatisfactory transportation facilities for shipments of fruit from Oakville, Ont., to Montreal, Ottawa, and other eastern points.

5046. A spotting charge of two dollars per car assessed by the Canadian Pacific Railway Company for placing shipments of oil and other products on a private siding at St. Stephen, N.B.

5047. Delay in transit to shipment of live stock on the Canadian Pacific Railway Company's line between Ponoka, Alta., and Kerrobert, Sask.

5048. Refusal of the Canadian Pacific Railway Company to make refund of an overcharge on shipment of household goods from Spokane, Wash., to Regina, Sask.

5049. The Canadian Northern Railway Company's freight charges on agricultural machinery from Regina to Mazenoid, Sask.

5050. Freight rate charged by the Canadian Northern Railway Company on shipments of coal from Ottawa, Ont., to Richmond, Ont.

5051. Dangerous level highway crossing one and a half miles south of Smith's Falls on the Canadian Pacific Railway at highway known as Elmsley Crossing.

5052. Unsatisfactory express service on fruit between the Niagara District and Montreal, Que.

5053. Overcrowding of trains on the Montreal and Southern Counties Railway between Montreal, P.Q., and Marieville, P.Q.

5054. The Canadian Pacific Railway Company not constructing a station at Brightmore siding, Sask., although land was purchased there for that purpose.

5055. Lack of effective cattle guards along the Canadian Pacific Railway Company's lines in the Province of Alberta.

5056. The Canadian Northern Railway Company blocking a crossing at Dummer, Sask., by constructing an elevator at that point.

5057. Alleged excessive express rates charged by the American Express Company on shipments of fruit from Fenwick, Ont., to Toronto, Ont.

5058. Dangerous condition of highway crossings over the Canadian Northern Railway in the municipality of Whitehead, Man.

5059. Refusal of the Canadian Pacific Railway Company to settle claim for alleged overcharge on a shipment of horses from Seaforth, Ont., to Sault Ste. Marie, Ont.

5060. The Michigan Central Railway assessing a car service charge for service performed on coal shipments at Windsor, Ont., consigned to Detroit, Mich., ex Pennsylvania points.

5061. Unsatisfactory condition of fencing along the right-of-way of the Canadian Northern Railway Company in the municipality of Minitonas, Man.

5062. Unsatisfactory train service furnished by the Grand Trunk Railway Company between St. Marys, Ont., and Sarnia, Ont.

5063. Usatisfactory manner in which the Canadian Pacific Railway Company's captain of the steamship "Bonnington" handles freight consigned to his charge on the Arrow Lakes, B.C.

5064. Freight rates on lumber charged by the International Railway Company.

5065. The Canadian Pacific Railway Company removing a spur line which the predecessors of a Winnipeg firm had installed and for which they paid four hundred dollars.

5066. Poor fencing of the Canadian Northern Railway Company in the vicinity of Altamont, Man.

5067. Fencing along the Canadian Pacific Railway Company's line between Yahk and Kingsgate, B.C.

5068. The Canadian Pacific Railway Company not constructing a loading platform at Gilroy, Sask.

5069. Freight rate charged by the Canadian Northern Railway Company for handling a shipment of household goods from Doland, U.S.A., to Battleford, Sask.

5070. Freight rate charged on a bath tub shipped from Walkerville, Ont. to Junkins, Alta.

5071. The Great Northern Railway Company making a settlement for shingles lost in transit at the cost price of the shingles instead of the selling price to the customer.

5072. The Canadian Pacific Railway Company closing public crossing at Ile Cadieux in the parish of St. Michel de Vaudreuil, Que.

5073. Alleged discrimination shown by the Grand Trunk Railway Company in the matter of granting rebate on cars loaded on private sidings at Collingwood, Ont.

5074. Noisy shunting performed by the Canadian Northern Railway trains in the vicinity of the Methodist Church at Yarker, Ont., on the Sabbath Day.

5075. The Canadian Northern Railway Company have refused to furnish a farm crossing between Mikado, Sask., and Veregin, Sask.

5076. Refusal of the Canadian Pacific Railway Company to reimburse complainant for cattle killed on right of way near Colonsay, Sask. although crossing gate was out of order.

5077. The Canadian Pacific Railway Company charging a higher rate than the one quoted on a shipment of steel from Pittsburg, U.S.A. to St. Stephen, N.B.

5078. Delays to shipments consigned over the Pere Marquette Railway to Corunna, Ont., and the unsatisfactory condition of station at that point.

5079. The Dominion Express Company at Bowmanville, Ont. refused to accept a parcel consigned to Wellington, Ont. on the Canadian Northern Railway.

5080. Damage caused by fire from Canadian Pacific Railway Company's engine at Herschel, Sask.

5081. The Canadian Northern Railway Company refusing to allow a sewer to be constructed under their tracks at Trenton, Ont.

5082. Refusal of the Grand Trunk Railway Company to make refund of demurrage charges which accrued on a car of coal consigned to Cannington, Ont.

5083. Dangerous level crossing on the town line between Stisted, Ont., and Stephenson, Ont. on the Grand Trunk Railway Company's northern division.

5084. Refusal of a railway company to grant a reduced rate for the return of an automobile chassis which was refused at destination.

5085. Unsatisfactory handling of the fruit business in British Columbia by the Canadian Pacific Railway Company.

5086. The Canadian Pacific Railway Company's fence at Readlyn, Sask., cutting off the town from access to the elevator.

5087. Lack of a proper crossing over the Canadian Northern Railway at Prince, Sask.

5088. An alleged shortage in weight of shipment of flax and wheat mixed shipped from Avonhurst, Sask. via the Canadian Pacific Railway to Port Arthur, Ont.

5089. Charges assessed by the Canadian Pacific Railway Company over and above railway fare on a trip from Winnipeg, Man., to Leipzig, Sask.

5090. Unnecessary whistling of locomotives within the town of Port Hope, Ont.

5091. Drainage facilities on the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway in the vicinity of Brechin, B.C.

5092. Lack of cattle guards on the Canadian Pacific Railway at Ensign Station, Alta.

5093. Alleged excessive switching charges assessed by the Pere Marquette Railway Company on shipments of gravel to McGregor Jct., Ont.

5094. Refusal of a day operator at Sherbrooke, Que., to sell passenger an excursion ticket covering passage to Magog, Que., but made him pay the full regular fare.

5095. Lack of drainage along the right of way of the Quebec Oriental Railway in the vicinity of Carleton, Que.

5096. Goods lost while in transit over the Grand Trunk Railway system from Pontiac, Mich., to Erie, Penn.

5097. Inadequate stockyard facilities at Botha, Alta., on the Canadian Pacific Railway.

5098. The Canadian Pacific Railway Company ordering tenants to vacate premises rented at Regina, Sask., and request the board to investigate the cause of such notice being given.

5099. Condition of farm crossing at lot 3, concession 8, township of Montague, Ont., on the Canadian Northern Railway.

5100. The Dominion Atlantic Railway Company employing enginemen who have not passed examinations on the general train and operating rules.

5101. Lack of proper station and shelter for passengers and freight at Prince, Sask., on the Canadian Northern Railway.

5102. Failure of the Canadian Northern Railway Company to make roadway safe at their ballast pit in the rural municipality of Pleasant Valley, Sask.

5103. Lack of proper roadway crossing the Canadian Northern Railway to the elevators at Prince, Sask.

5104. Carload rating on posts being shipped from Revelstoke, B.C., to prairie points.

5105. Height of telegraph wires just east of the Canadian Pacific Railway Company's yards at Malakwa, B.C.

5106. Clay from embankment of the Canadian Northern Railway causing damage to fields at lot 4, concession 4, township of Scarboro, Ont.

5107. Dangerous conditions existing at crossing between lots 10 and 11, concession 8, township of East Gwillimbury, Ont.

5108. Freight rates charged by the Canadian Pacific Railway Company on a shipment of settlers effects from Bowden, Alta., to Sibbald, Alta., and from Innisfail to Sibbald, via Camrose, Alta.

5109. The discontinuing of Saturday excursion to Picton, Ont., on the Canadian Northern Ontario Railway.

5110. Canadian Pacific Railway connections at Sharbot Lake, Ont.

5111. The cancellation of the Canadian Pacific Railway Company's daily trains 511 and 512 between Lethbridge and Medicine Hat, Alta.

5112. No facilities for handling milk shipments and other products at Bar River, Ont., on the Canadian Pacific Railway.

5113. Condition of fencing along the Northern and Erie Railway.

5114. Refusal of the Canadian Pacific Railway Company's agent at High River, Alta., to sell complainant a ticket from High River to Calgary, Alta., and return.

5115. Removal of assistants to station agent at Iroquois, Ont., on the Grand Trunk Railway.

5116. Alleged discrimination shown by the Canadian Pacific Railway in the matter of milling in transit rates on dried grains.

5117. Customs entry charges of one dollar and twenty cents billed by railroads in Detroit, Mich., on cars of lumber ex Callander, Ont.

5118. The Canadian Northern Railway Company running through Maidstone, Sask., showing trains on their time tables as "daily" when they only run "tri-weekly."

5119. Refusal of Edmonton, Dunvegan and British Columbia Railway Company to settle for steer killed on right of way which was not protected by cattleguards at time of accident.

5120. Increased freight rate on brick as contained in joint freight tariff of the Grand Trunk Railway Company, C.R.C. No. E. 2552.

5121. Refusal of express companies in Canada to carry live skunks in their cars.

5122. Proposed increase in minimum carload weights by railway companies on flour and mill products.

5123. The Canadian Pacific Railway Company's proposed increase in minimum carload weights of mill products.

5124. Failure of the Grand Trunk Railway Company to furnish a date for the farmers of Brant township to hold their excursion to Guelph Experimental Farm, at Guelph, Ont.

5125. Alleged excessive freight charges on a shipment of books from England to Marmora, Ont.

5126. The Canadian Northern Railway Company injuring the lumber and pulpwood trade in the township of Chisholm, Ont., by not opening their line for traffic through that township.

5127. The Pere Marquette Railway Company's foreman at St. Thomas, Ont. running engines on main line and in the yard although he has not passed qualifying examinations; also the condition of signals and lights on the Pere Marquette Railway west of St. Thomas, Ont.

5128. Electricity charged in tracks of the Niagara, St. Catharines and Toronto Railway Company at road-crossing between St. Catharines, Ont. and Niagara-on-the-Lake, the power of the electricity being sufficient to throw horses making the crossing.

5129. Improper fire guards along the line of the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway Company's Regina-Boundary Branch in the vicinity of Alameda, Sask.

5130. Freight rates on peas from Essex, Ont. to Shaunavon, Sask.

5131. Refusal of the Canadian Northern Express Company to settle a claim for eggs lost in transit between Bethune, Sask. and Regina, Sask.

5132. Damage to property at Alexander, Man., caused by fire from Canadian Pacific Railway Company's engines and the refusal of the Canadian Pacific Railway Company to grant remuneration for land rendered useless by ploughing of fireguards.

5133. Refusal of the Canadian Pacific Railway Company to settle claim for damage to shipment of stock on account of delay in transit and improper feeding and watering when shipped from Ontario to Irricana, Alta.

5134. Freight charges on a car of settlers' effects shipped via the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway from Edmonton, Alta. to Westlock, Alta.

5135. Train service on the Canadian Northern Railway from Parry Sound, Ont. Northbound.

5136. Trains of the Pere Marquette Railway Company blocking highway crossing just east of Ruthven Station, Ont.

5137. The Quebec and Lake St. John Railway Company discontinuing through train service between La Tuque, P.Q., and Rivière à Pierre Junction, Que.

5138. Alleged excessive freight charges of the Atlantic, Quebec and Western Railway Company and the Quebec Oriental Railway Company on a shipment of an engine and parts from Grand River, Que. to St. Hyacinthe, P.Q.

5139. Defective cattle guards used by the Canadian Northern Railway Company in the rural municipality of Carrot River, Sask.

5140. Lack of effective fencing on the Canadian Pacific Railway Company's right of way in the vicinity of Bawlf, Alta.

5141. Refusal of the Michigan Central Railway Company to grant a clear bill of lading on shipments of onions or to furnish a checker when shipping the onions in carload lots.

5142. Improper drainage along the line of the Caraquet and Gulf Shore Railway near Janeville, N. B.

5143. The Canadian Pacific Railway Company neglecting to settle claim for damages to property caused by the fire from their engines at Champlain, P.Q.

5144. Dangerous crossing on the Canadian Pacific Railway at Dixie, Ont.

5145. Poor first-class passenger accommodation supplied by the Grand Trunk Railway Company.

5146. Unsatisfactory fire guarding on the Canadian Northern Railway in the vicinity of Benton, Alta.

5147. The rate charged by the Canadian Northern Railway Company for Pullman accommodation as compared with sleeping car accommodation en route from Regina, Sask. to Prince Albert, Sask.

5148. The Grand Trunk Railway Company's train No. 28 not stopping at Baden, Ont.

5149. Refusal of the Bell Telephone Company to place subscriber's name in the directory with his address in a hotel in Montreal, Que.

5150. Alleged excessive freight rate on shipments of cement from Hull, P.Q., to Massey, Ont. as compared with rate from Sault Ste. Marie, Ont. to Massey, Ont.

5151. Time allowed by railway companies for the unloading of grain from cars.

5152. The Canadian Express Company charging an overweight on shipment of grapes from Beamsville, Ont. to Cardinal, Ont.

5153. Dangerous condition of bridge over the track of the old Carillon and Grenville Railway in the township of Chatham, Que.

5154. Cars on the line of the Brantford and Hamilton Electric Railway not stopping long enough to allow passengers to entrain.

5155. Refusal of the Bell Telephone Company to refund telephone charges for a quarter when subscriber's office had been closed for that term.

5156. The Kettle Valley Railway Company clearing right-of-way and leaving debris and timber on adjacent property where it becomes an expense to the owner of the land to clear and is a menace of fire danger.

5157. Tariff G.F.D. No. 85 of the Algoma Eastern Railway Company in connection with the Northern Navigation Company and the Dominion Transportation Company, Limited, covering traffic between Collingwood, Owen Sound, Sudbury and intermediate points.

5158. The Canadian Pacific Railway Company's proposed change of the daily train service between Rossland and Trail, B.C., into a tri-weekly service.

5159. Unsatisfactory boat service rendered by the Huntsville and Lake of Bays Navigation Company.

5160. Inconvenience caused to the travelling public on account of the railway companies not furnishing advance notices of proposed changes in timetables.

5161. Refusal of the Canadian Pacific Railway Company to settle claim for expenses incurred on account of non-delivery of a shipment of household goods sent from Birmingham, Alta., to Winnipeg, Man.

5162. Freight rate charged on a shipment of apples sent by lake and rail route from Ayr, Ont., to Strathclair, Man.

5163. The Canadian Northern Express Company's rate on dressed poultry from Enterprise, Ont., to Montreal, P.Q.

5164. Freight rates on paper shipped from Jonquière, Que., to Winnipeg, Man., and the poor condition of boats of the Canada Steamship Lines which result in damaged paper at destination.

5165. The Georgian Bay and Seaboard Railway Company's bridge opposite lot 13, concession 8, township of Eldon, Ont., not having a sufficient opening to properly take care of the drainage in its neighbourhood.

5166. Freight charged by the Canadian Pacific Railway Company on a shipment of six horses from Fredericton, N.B., to Allanburg, Ont., as compared with freight rates on the Intercolonial Railway.

5167. The Great Northern Railway Company outlawing a claim because notice of damage to shipment was not received within a specified time after receipt of the goods.

5168. Tariff W. 3248 issued by the Canadian Pacific Railway Company, which provided mileage tariff on grain in carload lots within specified area not being available except to certain specified consignees.

5169. Refusal of the Dominion Express Company to accept Great Northern and Northern Pacific refrigerators for loading at Selkirk, Man., to be moved by freight to Winnipeg, Man., and Great Northern or Northern Pacific from Winnipeg, Man., the Dominion Express Company claiming the right to route equipment via the Soo line when destination is Chicago, Ill.

5170. Railway tariffs showing a greater rate on hay moving into Winnipeg, Man., than shipments moving out of Winnipeg, Man., thus increasing the farmers' cost to market hay at that point.

5171. The Canadian Freight Classification No. 16 which states that shipments of whisky must be made up in barrels only or in cases only in order to get the minimum carload rates in each case.

5172. Refusal of the Canadian Pacific Railway Company to settle claim for cow killed on their line of railway due to lack of proper cattle-guards at Bissett Creek, Ont.

5173. Alleged discrimination shown by the Canadian Pacific Railway Company in the way they are charging on the weight of packages used for the transportation of wire nails.

5174. Freight rates on china clay from Huberdeau, P.Q., to other points in Canada.

5175. Refusal of a farmer at Harte, Man., to allow the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway Company to plough fire-guards.

5176. Refusal of a farmer at Brookdale, Man., to allow the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway Company to plough fire-guards.

5177. The Edmonton, Dunvegan and British Columbia Railway Company delay in filing a location plan of their line through the west half of section 32, township 59, range 26, west of the fourth meridian thus delaying the transfer of title for this land to the complainant.

5178. Unsatisfactory train service on the Canadian Northern Railway Dalmeny to Laird, Sask.

5179. Refusal of the Hamilton, Grimbsy and Beamsville Railway Company to reimburse complainant for goods broken in transit from Agincourt to Beamsville, Ont.

5180. Freight rates on dressed granite on Grand Trunk and Quebec, Montreal and Southern Railways.

5181. Train service and the operation of trains by unqualified trainmen on the Canadian Northern Railway from Kamloops, B.C., to mileage 121.

5182. Grading of the Canadian Pacific Railway Company's crossing in the village of Ste. Thérèse, P.Q.

5183. The right of way of the Canadian Pacific Railway Company being too close to the public highway in the municipality of St. Francis Xavier, Que.

5184. Dangerous way in which trains are handled on the Pere Marquette Railway between Port Stanley, St. Thomas and London, Ont.

5185. Refusal of the Grand Trunk Railway Company to revise their rules governing reconsignment and diversion of shipments of bananas so that United States shippers could have same privileges similar as those extended to shippers of citrus fruit from California.

5186. The Canadian Northern Railway Company removing telephone from station at Grandview, Man.

5187 Failure of the Canadian Northern Railway Company to repair road leading over their right of way and up to Beadle elevators in the rural municipality of Kindersley, Sask.

5188 Treatment received from the Canadian Northern Railway Company in the matter of right of way purchased on their Saskatoon-Calgary branch and claim for damages on account of unsatisfactory fencing, near Munson, Alta.

5189. Lack of proper fencing along the right of way of the Canadian Northern Railway at Delta, Ont.

5190. The Canadian Pacific Railway Company ereeting a fence in front of complainant's property at Hartley, Ont., on the Port McNicoll branch.

5191. Inability of complainant to secure a settlement of claim for loss and damage caused in the shipment of horses from Dutton, Ont., to Watrous, Sask., over the Pere Marquette Railway, the Canadian Pacific Railway and the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway.

5192. The Canadian Pacific Railway Company blocking the crossing of city transmission line of the City Light and Power Department, city of Winnipeg, Man., at lot 58, parish of Kildonan, Man.

5193. Coal rates as specified in the new Canadian Pacific Railway Company's tariff No. 2-2899, C.R.C. No. E. 2870.

5194. Dangerous crossing on the Kingston road, near West Hill, Ont., where the Grand Trunk and the York Radial Railways intersect.

5195. Train service of the Quebec Oriental Railway Company in the counties of Bonaventure and Gaspé, Quebec.

5196. The Grand Trunk Pacific Railway Company refusing to settle claim for shortage in shipment consigned to Delburne, Alta.

5197. Train service on the Canadian Northern Railway between Notre Dame des Anges and Garneau Junction, Que.

5198. The Halifax and Southwestern Railway Company closing station at Argyle, N.S.

5199. The Grand Trunk Railway Company's proposed change in roadbed through the town of Campbellford, Ont., at the junction where the track crosses the Trent Canal.

5200. Protest against the decision of the Canadian Car Service Bureau in the matter of a claim for refund of demurrage charges on a car of brick delayed at Mile End, P.Q.

5201. Station and platform of the Canadian Northern Railway Company at Bois Blanc in the Parish of Ste. Justine, P.Q.

5202. The Canadian Pacific Railway Company removing planks from crossing at Beaver, B.C.

5203. The Canadian Northern Railway Company placing a culvert and constructing a ditch so that water runs through the centre of a farm at Stonefield, Que.

5204. New timetable of the Canadian Northern Ontario Railway Company covering train service to and from Deseronto, Ont.

5205. The Canadian Northern Railway Company using a motor passenger car between Trenton and Belleville, Ont., in which the seats are not reversible and as the railway company have no facilities for turning the car at Belleville, Ont., passengers had to ride sitting backward on the return trip.

5206. The Grand Trunk Railway Company's rates on sand and gravel from Sherks, Ont., to Black Rock and Buffalo, N.Y., as shewn in new schedule C.R.C. No. E. 2996.

5207. The Canadian Northern Railway Company blocking the various crossings of the Edmonton Radial Railway Company with switching and shunting operations.

5208. The Canadian Pacific Railway Company refusing to settle claim for horse killed on their right of way at Creston, B.C., although there was no cattle guard protection at this point.

5209. Condition of the cattleguards on the Canadian Northern Railway in the vicinity of Big Valley, Alta.

5210. Unsatisfactory freight service at Yarker Station, Ont., on the Canadian Northern Railway.

5211. The proposed closing of Pelletier Avenue, county of Quebec, Que.

5212. Alleged unsatisfactory service rendered by the Bell Telephone Company in the city of Montreal, Que.

5213. Freight rate charged by the Canadian Pacific Railway Company on two barrels of apples shipped from Milton, Ont., to Winnipeg, Man.

5214. Alleged refusal of the Grand Trunk Railway Company to furnish refrigerator cars for the shipment of apples from Innerkip, Ont., to points in the West.

5215. Refusal of the Kingston and Pembroke Railway Company (C.P.R.) to weigh carloads at the Locomotive Company's scales at Kingston, Ont., although the Railway Company's scales were defective.

5216. The Canadian Pacific Railway Company removing wooden sidewalk from across tracks opposite Duncan Station, B.C.

5217. Canadian Freight Classification covering the shipment of "K.D. Chairs" from Danville, Que., to Western points.

5218. Condition of fences along the right of way of the Grand Trunk Railway Company near Edgington station, Ont.

5219. The proposed removal of station at Dayton, Ont., to a point two miles east of present site on the Canadian Pacific Railway.

5220. Inability to secure refrigerator cars for the shipment of apples from Oxford Centre, Ont. on either the Grand Trunk or Canadian Pacific Railway.

5221. Location of cattle pass across the Erie and Ontario Railway between lots 4 and 5, concession 2, township of Gainsboro, Ont.

5222. Increase in freight rate on brick for distance over ninety to one thousand miles, as per Supplement No. 68 to Tariff E. 2166.

5223. The Michigan Central Railway Company closing farm crossings on property of complainant at Dutton, Ont.

5224. The manner in which the Bell Telephone Company enter up long distance calls on their accounts, the companies to which the bills are sent being unable to check up the charges to see if they are correct.

5225. Delay of the Canadian Pacific Railway Company in settling for land expropriated from complainant on lot 31, concession 7, township of Pickering, Ont.

5226. Delay to a shipment of cattle on the Canadian Pacific Railway from Bowell, Alta. to Fort Steele, B.C. and the poor facilities provided for the unloading of his stock at destination.

5227. Alleged overcharge on a shipment of household goods shipped from Lakefield, Ont. to North Edmonton, Alta. on the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway.

5228. Delay of the Canadian Northern Railway Company in paying for services performed ploughing fireguards at Cullen, Sask.

5229. Loss of oats in transit over the Canadian Northern Railway shipped from Muenster, Sask.

5230. Alleged unjust charge of the Bell Telephone Company for service used jointly by a nurse and a business firm at Toronto, Ont.

5231. Condition of Grand Trunk Pacific Railway Company's crossing with highway at the convergence of four sections, 21, 22, 27 and 28, township 32, range 22, west of the Third Meridian.

5232. Injury to the fish industry in the Province of British Columbia caused by the blocking of rivers and streams by driftwood and debris caught in construction work at trestles and piles of bridges on various lines of railways in that province.

5233. Treatment received by complainant at the hands of the Canadian Northern Railway Company in connection with some luggage arriving on the *Royal George* which was forwarded to Montreal in error instead of being unloaded at Quebec.

5234. Fire caused by sparks from Canadian Pacific Railway Company's trains in Yoho Park at Wapta, B.C.

5235. Increase in switching charges of the Canadian Pacific Railway Company.

5236. Station accommodation in the village of Chicoutimi, Que. on the Quebec and Lake St. John Railway.

5237. Smoke nuisance, noise of shunting, whistling and bell ringing in Chicoutimi, Que. on the Quebec and Lake St. John Railway.

5238. Unsafe condition of roadbed on the Quebec and Lake St. John Railway.

5239. The railway companies adding a switching charge at mine sidings in Alberta such charges having a tendency to counterbalance recent reduction on rates on coal and heavy goods.

5240. The Canadian Northern Railway Company increasing freight rate on returning empties, which increase partly offsets the recent reduction in freight rates ordered by the board.

5241. The Canadian Northern Railway Company increasing freight rates on shipments consigned to points on the Grand Trunk Railway between Montreal and Toronto, Ont.

5242. Alleged excessive freight rates on oils and gasolene from Fort William, Ont. to Elrose, Sask. as compared with freight rates on wheat from Elrose to Fort William, Ont.

5243. Switching rate charged by the Canadian Pacific Railway Company for switching cars from the Intercolonial Railway Company's tracks to the Canadian Pacific Railway Company's elevator at St. John, N.B.

5244. Interswitching charges at Hamilton, Ont., between the Grand Trunk and the Toronto, Hamilton and Buffalo Railway Companies.

5245. Condition of crossing gates and fences on the Thunder Hill subdivision of the Canadian Northern Railway Company.

5246. The Brantford and Hamilton Electric Railway Company removing a watchman at a dangerous point known as Rock Cut just outside of Hamilton, Ont.

5247. Alleged carelessness shown by conductors in the handling of trains on the British Columbia Electric Railway Company's line.

5248. Lack of cattleguards on the Edmonton, Dunvegan, and British Columbia Railway.

5249. Damage to crop caused by a fire which was started by sparks from train on the Canadian Pacific Railway near Dunkirk, Sask.

5250. Dangerous crossing on the Grand Trunk Railway Company's line just outside the limits of the town of Port Dover, Ont., in the township of Woodhouse, Ont.

5251. Lack of weigh scales in the stock yards of the Canadian Pacific Railway Company at Melville, Sask.

5252. The erection of a bridge across the north arm of the Fraser River as contemplated by the Canadian Northern Pacific Railway Company.

5253. Supplement No. 6 to the Canadian Northern Railway Company's tariff No. E. 295 which advances the rates from Merriton and Thorold, Ont. to points in the United States.

5254. Freight charges on a colt shipped from Caplan to Matapedia, Que. on the Quebec Oriental Railway.

5255. Demurrage charges on refrigerator cars at Montreal, Que.

5256. Alleged unjust charges for overweight and the feeding of stock in transit from Frelighsburg, Que. to Alberta.

5257. Damage to hay crop caused by a fire which was started by sparks from an engine on the Canadian Pacific Railway near Gouverneur, Sask.

5258. Alleged unsatisfactory rule of the Quebec Oriental Railway Company that a separate bill of lading be furnished for each car shipped.

5259. The Kootenay Central Railway Company's proposal to give the name "Radium" to a station constructed twenty-six miles from Radium Hot Springs and adjacent to the Fairmont Hot Springs.

5260. Refusal of the Canadian Pacific Railway Company to settle claim for an alleged overcharge on a shipment of household goods shipped to Bethune, Sask. on the ground that the complainant had not submitted the original receipted expense bill to verify the claim.

5261. Proposed freight increase on skelp shipped in carloads from Pittsburg District to Welland, Ont.

5262. The Canadian Northern Railway Company assessing freight charges on a basis of 40,000 pounds minimum weight per carload of potatoes.

5263. The Algoma Central Railway Company charging excessive rates on shipments of wood.

5264. The Grand Trunk Railway Company's tariff supplement 260 to C.R.C. E. 2552, which raises the minimum carload weights on bricks from 40,000 to 50,000 pounds.

5265. Unsatisfactory time of trains on the Canadian Northern Ontario Railway running through Starkville and Osaca stations which is detrimental to pupils attending school at Port Hope, Ont.

5266. Photographic supplies being held up by the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway Company under bond at Edmonton, Alta.

5267. Fire damage to property near Alix, Alta. on the Calgary to Edmonton, Alta. branch of the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway Company caused by fire started by sectionmen.

5268. Condition of fences along the Parry Sound Division of the Grand Trunk Railway Company.

5269. Alleged excessive charge of the Canadian Express Company who are assessing a minimum charge of fifty cents on parcels shipped to the west.

5270. Switching charge of two dollars per car on shipments of cars of coal from Edmonton, Alta. to Lloydminster, Sask.

5271. Unsafe condition of engines 750 and 853 running out of Smiths Falls, Ont. on the Canadian Pacific Railway.

5272. Proposed change in train service between Ottawa and Cumberland, Ont., on the Canadian Northern Ontario Railway.

5273. Delay of the Lake Erie and Northern Railway Company in settling for land taken for railway purposes in lots 25 and 26., township of South Dumfries, Ont.

5274. Alleged excessive rates charged by the Canadian Northern Railway Company on two carloads of machinery shipped from Prince Albert, Sask., to Le Pas, Man.

5275. Proposed curtailment of the first-class passenger trains on the Canadian Northern Prince Albert to Winnipeg line to a tri-weekly service.

5276. The Canadian Pacific Railway Company refusing to allow a passenger to stop-over en route from Calgary to Irricana and return unless it was so specified on his ticket.

5277. The Canadian Northern and Dominion Express companies proposed cancellation of present rate on frozen fish between Winnipeg, Man., and Detroit, Mich.

5278. The Canadian Pacific Railway Company removing planking at farm crossings every fall.

5279. Lack of farm crossing and fencing through property of complainant at Eunice, Alta., on the Edmonton, Dunvegan and British Columbia Railway.

5280. Proposed change of train service on the Grand Trunk Railway between Listowel and Stratford, Ont.

5281. Freight rate on lumber from Cache Bay to Gananoque, Ont., and the Canadian Pacific Railway Company not publishing through rates to points on the Grand Trunk Railway, east of Kingston, Ont.

5282. Size of culvert on the Georgian Bay and Seaboard Railway at Lot 16, Concession 2, township of Eldon, Ont.

5283. The Canadian Northern Express Company's service for live poultry between Enterprise, Ont. and Montreal, Que.

5284. Freight rate on shipment of automobile and parts from Walkerville, Ont., to Pilot Mound, Man., over the Canadian Pacific Railway.

5285. Cartage charges at Ottawa, Ont., on shipments arriving on the Grand Trunk Railway.

5286. Grand Trunk Railway Company's Supplement No. 260, to Tariff C.D. 65, C.R.C. E. 2552, which increases the minimum carload weight on stone.

5287. Delay in transit to shipments of hogs from Wilcox and Milestone stations, Sask., on the Canadian Pacific Railway.

5288. The Canadian Northern Railway Company proposed closing of Howell station, Sask.

5289. The Canadian Northern Railway Company discontinuing the running of trains numbered 21 and 22 between Winnipeg, Man., and Fort Francis, Man.

5290. Unsatisfactory train service on the Grand Trunk Railway at Kerrwood, Ont.

5291. The Canadian Pacific Railway Company proposed removal of station agent from Elmstead station, Ont.

5292. The Canadian Northern Railway Company's trains continually blocking surveyed trail to Lac Ste. Anne, Alta.

5293. Reduction of train service on the Stratford Division of the Grand Trunk Railway.

5294. The Canadian Northern Railway Company not granting compensation for a steer killed on their right of way through lack of effective cattleguards in the vicinity of Big Valley, Alta.

5295. Faulty condition of culvert on the line of the Canadian Pacific Railway at lot 17, concession 2, township of North Orillia, Ont.

5296. The Ontario Hydro-Electric Power Commission constructing power wire crossing the Canadian Pacific Railway tracks at mile 0·62, St. Mary's Subdivision, without regard to the order of the board with respect to wire crossings.

5297. Diversion of St. Patrick street, Lasalle, Que., by the Canadian Pacific Railway Company in connection with their construction work on the Lachine canal bridge.

5298. Delay in the transportation of shipments from Jonquière, Que., to points in the West on account of improper routing given such shipments.

5299. Refusal of the Canadian Pacific Railway Company to grant commutation rates to lady student attending school at New Westminster, B.C., covering transportation between Essondale, B.C., and New Westminster, B.C.

5300. The Michigan Central Railway Company routing shipments on corn between Essex, Ont., and Listowel, Ont., in such a manner as to make the freight rate comparatively high for the shipper.

5301. Excessive freight rates quoted on a shipment of household effects sent from Grenville, P.Q., to Colorado, U.S.A., routed via the Canadian Pacific Railway.

5302. The Great Northern Railway refusing to reimburse complainant for case of oil and bag of rolled oats lost in transit to Otter, B.C.

5303. Refusal of the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway Company to settle for cattle killed on their right of way at Three Hills, Alta., although cattleguards had been removed from crossing at that point.

5304. The Canadian Pacific Railway Company removing station agent from Harrietsville station.

5305. The proposed closing of Brunkild station, Man., on the Canadian Northern Railway.

5306. Fire damage to wheat crop at Midale, Sask., caused from sparks from engines of the Canadian Northern Railway.

5307. Inability of complainant to secure large enough cars for shipments of grain from Crossfield, Alta.

5308. Mixed train service on the Canadian Pacific Railway between Winnipeg, Man., and Riverton, Man.

5309. The Canadian Pacific Railway Company proposed cancellation of tariff No. W. 3040 relative to grain shipments over the Canadian Pacific and Great Northern Railways to points in British Columbia.

5310. Train service furnished by the Canadian Northern Railway to patrons in the vicinity of Marchand, Man.

5311. Refusal of the Canadian Express Company to settle claim for damage to bees shipped from Glenwood, Mich., U.S.A., to Markham, Ont.

5312. The Canadian Pacific Railway Company's freight rates on desiccated vegetables.

5313. Condition of crossings in the municipality of Langley, B.C., on the line of the Vancouver, Victoria and Eastern Railway and Navigation Company.

5314. Freight and storage charges on a bale of tobacco shipped from Granby, Que., to Glenton, and later returned to point of shipping on the Central Vermont Railway.

5315. Notice of hearing not being sent to interested party in Toronto, Ont., in connection with a case heard before the board.

5316. The Canadian Northern Railway Company's proposed removal of station agent from Sleeman station, Ont.

5317. The Canadian Northern Railway Company's proposed removal of station agent from St. Laurent Station, Man.

5318. Refusal of the Toronto Eastern Railway Company to construct a culvert to carry off surface water from a main at Bowmanville, Ont.

5319. Proposed removal of station agent from Lavoy Station, Alta., on the line of the Canadian Northern Railway.

5320. Proposed removal of station agent from Waseca Station, Sask., on the Canadian Northern Railway.

5321. Conduct of a conductor in the employ of the Canadian Northern Railway running a train in the vicinity of McNutt, Sask.

5322. Charges made by the Boston and Maine Railway Company for wire crossings constructed over their right of way by the Sherbrooke Railway and Power Company.

5323. Refusal of the Edmonton, Dunvegan and British Columbia Railway Company to make settlement for horse killed on their right of way.

5324. The Grand Trunk Pacific Railway Company removing cattle guards at crossings on their railway in the vicinity of Stony Beach, Sask.

5325. Removal of station agent from station at Jeanette, Ont., on the Grand Trunk Railway.

5326. The Canadian Northern Railway Company proposed removal of station agent from Norquay Station, Sask.

5327. Unsafe condition of a number of locomotives running out of Ottawa on the Canadian Pacific Railway.

5328. Increase in freight rates on mill feed from Lethbridge, Alta., to Fruitvale, B.C., over the Canadian Pacific and Great Northern Railways.

5329. The Canadian Northern Railway Company's train service between Winnipeg, Man., and Gypsumville, Man.

5330. Condition of road leading into Harrogate Station, B.C., on the Canadian Pacific Railway.

5331. The Canadian Northern Railway Company's proposed removal of station agent from Warren, Man.

5332. Refusal of the Great Northern Railway Company to restore planks in crossing at ranch lot 2027, Similkameen division, Yale district, B.C.

5333. Excessive storage charges on safes at Hamilton, Ont., as compared with charges on lighter but more bulky goods.

5334. Proposed Supplement No. 1 to Canadian Pacific Railway's Tariff C.R.C. E. 2847 which cancels the rates from a number of points on the Canadian Pacific railway to Mechanicsville, N.Y., via the Boston and Maine railroad.

5335. Fire damage to a wheat crop caused by fire from a Canadian Northern engine near Bethune, Sask.

5336. Excessive tolls charged for code messages on the Canadian Pacific and Great North Western Telegraph lines.

5337. The Canadian Pacific Railway Company permitting the operation of engine No. 3091 without being equipped with an ash pan that can be dumped without the necessity of employees going under the engine for that purpose.

5338. Dangerous crossing of the Great Northern Railway over Front Street near the intersection of Columbia Street, New Westminster, B.C.

5339. The Canadian Pacific, Grand Trunk and Canadian Northern Railway Companies' proposed tariffs which state that rates named on vegetables will apply only when shipments are loaded in box cars and that when refrigerator cars are used rates will be on the classification basis, i.e., the 8th class.

5340. The Canadian Pacific Railway Company refusing to run any more cars into the lumber siding at Souris, Man.

5341. Condition of certain drainage works across the right of way of the Canadian Pacific Railway between sections 30 and 31, township 14, range 2 east and also at Stony Mountain in the rural municipality of Rockwood, Man.

5342. The Bell Telephone Company's proposed removal of telephones from farmers in the vicinity of Winchester, Ont.

5343. Refusal of the Canadian Northern Railway Company to allow complainant to remove baggage from their possession at Saskatoon, Sask., until he had settled a hospital bill for services rendered his son who was held at Quebec, Que., on order of the immigration officials until his burned foot had been attended to.

5344. Refusal of the Canadian Pacific Railway Company to establish a special winter freight rate on rough unpeeled pulpwood.

5345. The Canadian Pacific Railway Company having no through rate covering shipments of apples from points in Ontario to Portland, Me., U.S.A., for export.

5346. Demurrage charges on a car of oats shipped from Lashburn, Sask., to Anerley, Sask., but billed in error to Conquest, Sask., on the Canadian Northern Railway.

5347. Refusal of the Edmonton, Dunvegan and British Columbia Railway Company to make settlement for damage to his property in the northeast quarter of section 1, township 58, range 27, west of the fourth meridian.

5348. The Canadian Pacific Railway Company cancelling tariff No. 3040 covering grain shipments over the Canadian Pacific Railway Company to points in British Columbia on the Great Northern Railway.

5349. Refusal of the Grand Trunk Railway Company to consider a claim for expense and inconvenience caused complainant's wife on account of poor train connections while travelling between Gravenhurst, Ont. and Coldwater, Ont.

5350. Alleged excessive rates charged on a car of lumber shipped from Parry Sound, Ont. over the Canadian Pacific Railway to York Station, Ont. which is a station on the Grand Trunk Railway.

5351. Alleged excessive charges of the Dominion and American Express Companies on a racing sulky shipped from Inkerman to Ottawa, Ont. via Finch, Ont.

5352. Refusal of the British Columbia Electric Railway Company to handle cars destined ex points on the Great Northern or Northern Pacific Railway making it impossible for complainants to get equipment to load at their mill at Eburne, B.C. other than that of the Canadian Pacific Railway.

5353. Excessive freight charges on a car of coal shipped from Ogdensburg, N.Y. to Newboro, Ont., via ferry at Prescott, Ont., and the Grand Trunk and Brockville, Westport and Northwestern railways.

5354. The Canadian Northern Railway Company employing an engine hostler at Ottawa, Ont. who has not passed the required examinations.

5355. Removing of planking at farm crossings in the vicinity of Swift Current, Sask., on the Canadian Pacific Railway.

5356. Unsatisfactory manner in which the Canadian Northern Railway Company are handling their trains between Trenton, Ont. and Belleville, Ont.

5357. Unsatisfactory train connections for travellers coming from both southern Manitoba and Saskatchewan to points on the Canadian Pacific Railway between Brandon and Winnipeg, Man.

5358. Refusal of the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway Company to settle claim for baggage lost in transit to Spruce Bluff, Sask.

5359. Fire damage to property at Cedoux, Sask., on the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway on account of lack of fire guards.

5360. Proposed increase in freight rates on pulpwood on the Quebec Central Railway.

5361. Train service on the Edmonton-Athabaska extension of the Canadian Northern Railway.

5362. Refusal of the Canadian Northern Railway Company to place cars on a siding at Regina, Sask. until demurrage charges which accrued on previous cars had been paid.

5363. Removal of planking at farm crossing at Napanee, Ont., by employees of the Canadian Northern Railway Company.

5364. Train service on the Montreal and Southern Counties Railway.

5365. Refusal of conductor on the Niagara, St. Catharines and Toronto Railway to accept ticket good for passage between St. Catharines and Port Weller, Ont., claiming that the complainant was on the wrong train.

5366. Condition of fences on the right of way of the Grand Trunk Railway Company in the township of South Algoma, Ont.

5367. Refusal of the Grand Trunk Railway Company to make a refund of an alleged unjust charge in connection with passenger fare from Hamilton to New York, N.Y., and return.

5368. Unsatisfactory train and mail service furnished by the Canadian Northern Railway Company at Glenora, Man.

5369. Unsafe condition of locomotives on the Grand Trunk Railway out of Allandale, Ont.

5370. Alleged excessive freight rate on shipments of apples (boxed) from Grimsby, Ont., to Glasgow, Scotland.

5371. Condition of fencing on the Canadian Northern Railway in Hunson, Alta.

5372. Refusal of the Canadian Northern Railway Company to settle claim for non delivery of goods shipped from Montreal, P.Q., to Morinville, Alta.

5373. Freight rates on shipments of potatoes from points in New Brunswick to Belleville, Ont., over the Canadian Pacific and Grand Trunk railways.

5374. Alleged excessive telephone rate charged for a residence telephone installed in residence at Lawrence Park within the limits of the city of Toronto, Ont.

5375. Employees of the Great North Western Telegraph Company reporting news for information of newspapers and other publishers.

5376. Train and mail service of the Pere Marquette Railway Company at Wallaceburg, Ont.

5377. Change in train and mail service of the Pere Marquette Railway.

5378. Refusal of the Grand Trunk Railway Company to supply single car equipment for the loading of forty foot poles and piling at Toronto, Ont., thus compelling complainants to load this class of material on two cars charging higher freight rate.

5379. Inadequate Sunday train service on the Michigan Central Railway at Windham, Ont.

5380. The Haha Bay Railway Company proposed breaking off of train connection with the Quebec and Lake St. John Railway trains at Haha Bay Junction, P.Q.

5381. Train service of the Grand Trunk Railway Company to and from Milverton, Ont.

5382. Improper drainage resulting in damage to property along the Canadian Pacific Railway Company's right of way at Welsford, N.B.

5383. Alleged excessive freight charges on a shipment of sleighs from Ottawa, Ont. to Westmeath, Ont.

5384. The National Transcontinental Railway Company discontinuing the use of transfer track with the Canadian Pacific Railway at Wapske, N.B.

5385. Proposed closing of Grasshill Station, Ont., on the Canadian Pacific Railway.

5386. The Canadian Northern Railway Company not fencing their right-of-way on their Hudson Bay Branch near Canora, Sask.

5387. The Canadian Pacific Railway Company cancelling an evening train running from St. Jerome to Montreal, Que.

5388. Demurrage charges assessed on a car of coal, the Canadian Pacific Railway Company stating delay occurred and demurrage accrued waiting release by the customs.

5389. Proposed closing of Brechin Station, Ont., on the Canadian Pacific Railway, Georgian Bay and Seaboard Division.

5390. Proposed location of station on the Edmonton, Dunvegan and British Columbia Railway at Eunice, Alta.

5391. The Canadian Pacific Railway Company's agent at North Portal, Sask., advising complainants that the services of a customs broker are required to clear shipments of grain going to the United States.

5392. The Canadian Pacific Railway Company refusing to settle for flour damaged in their sheds at Rutter, Ont.

5393. The Canada and Gulf Terminal Railway not settling a claim for overcharges on shipments of coal.

5394. The Canadian Pacific Railway Company not granting refund on unused portions of ticket covering passage, Vancouver to Toronto, Ont. and return.

5395. Freight overcharges on settlers' effects shipped over the Canadian Pacific Railway Company's line from North Portal to Saskatoon, Sask.

5396. Refusal of the Great Northern Railway Company to settle a claim for freight damaged at Fruitvale, B.C. on account of doors being left open at the station.

5397. Proposed changes in train service on the Grand Trunk Railway out of London, Ont.

5398. Freight rates on brick from Ascot, Que., to Newport, Vt., over the lines of the Quebec Central and Boston and Maine railway lines.

5399. The Canadian Northern Railway Company delaying the settlement of a claim for overcharge on a shipment of shoes from Montreal, Que., to Vermilion, Alta.

5400. The Great Northern Railway Company changing their train and mail service through Similkameen, B.C.

5401. Condition of ditches constructed to drain the right of way of the Canadian Pacific Railway through the municipality of St. Paul, Man.

5402. The Canadian Pacific Railway Company proposal to close Godfrey Station in the township of Hinchinbrooke, Ont.

5403. Proposed closing of Lavant Station, Ont., on the Canadian Pacific Railway.

5404. Proposed closing of Blackfalds Station, Alberta, by Canadian Pacific Railway Company.

5405. Removal of agent and closing of station at Snow Road in the township of Palmerston, Ont.

5406. Dangerous conditions of highway crossing over the Grand Trunk Railway between lots 9 and 10, concession 4, township of Hawkesbury, Ont.

5407. The Canadian Pacific Railway Company's five per cent increase in freight rates covering shipments going into the United States.

5408. Grand Trunk Railway Company's freight rate on clay from Junction Cut on the outskirts of Hamilton, Ont., into the City of Hamilton, Ont.

5409. Refusal of the Grand Trunk Railway Company to settle a claim for coal lost while in transit to Ottawa, Ont.

5410. Unsatisfactory train service of the Bedlington and Nelson Railway between Port Hill, Ida and Wynndel, B.C.

5411. Refusal of the Canadian Pacific Railway Company to settle a claim for loss in a shipment of pictures and frames from Boston, Mass. to Kingston, Ont.

5412. Refusal of the Canadian Pacific Railway Company to allow complainants the privilege of inspecting shipments of desiccated vegetables at Belleville, Ont., while shipment was en route from Casnovia and Mayville, Mich., to West St. John.

5413. Highway crossing over the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway at Stony Beach, Sask., being defective on account of the planking being too low between the rails.

5414. Station accommodation and train service of the Canadian Pacific Railway at Norwood, Ont.

5415. Express rates on live lobsters between Weymouth, N.S., and Montreal, P.Q., handled by the Dominion Express Company.

5416. The Bell Telephone Company at Quebec, Que., increasing the rate for a desk telephone in a private residence.

5417. The Brockville, Westport and Northwestern Railway Company removing siding from their line of railway near the Lyn road, a point about two miles from Brockville, Ont.

5418. The Grand Trunk Railway Company's agent at Burford, Ont., holding a car of freight addressed to complainant until an alleged unjust charge for car rental should be collected.

5419. Proposed changes in train and mail service on the Central Ontario branch of the Canadian Northern Ontario Railway at Maynooth, Ont.

5420. The proposed closing of Harrison Mills Station, B.C., by the Canadian Pacific Railway Company.

5421. Proposed supplement No. 24 to Tariff E. 2080, C.R.C. No. E. 2480 which increases the freight rates on grain products from Fort William, Ont., to points in Ontario, Quebec and the Maritime Provinces.

5422. Delay of the Canadian Northern Railway Company in picking up three cars of stock loaded at Bruno, Sask., thereby causing a loss by shrinkage.

5423. Train service furnished by the Canadian Pacific Railway Company, on its Moosejaw-Portal section at Ralph, Sask.

5424. Unsatisfactory train service on the Halifax and Southwestern Railway between Caledonia and Lunenburg, N.S., and the removal of a number of station agents by that company.

5425. Unsatisfactory treatment received from the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway Company in the matter of compensation for land for waste purposes at Three Hill, Alta.

5426. The Quebec Oriental Railway Company placing obstructions and causing a nuisance to the public at highway crossing at Maria, P.Q.

5427. Changes in train service on the Toronto to North Bay branch of the Grand Trunk Railway.

5428. Cancellation of trains Nos. 41 and 44 operating between Huntsville and North Bay, Ont., on the Grand Trunk Railway.

5429. Alleged unjust dismissal of an employee of the Canadian Pacific Railway Company from diamond crossing with the Kingston and Pembroke Railway at Sharbot Lake, Ont.

5430. Freight classification given by the Canadian Pacific Railway Company on "screen plates."

5431. Unsatisfactory train service on the Canadian Northern Railway running through Newburg and Camden East, Ont.

5432. Alleged unjust charges made by the Grand Trunk Railway Company for services of the Great North Western Telegraph linemen and sectionmen in assisting to move a barn across their tracks at Beamsville, Ont.

5433. Freight charges on frozen fish shipped from Gypsumville, Man., to Jansen, Sask., over the lines of the Canadian Northern and Canadian Pacific Railways.

5434. The Canadian Pacific Railway Company closing Oso station, Ont., without giving any notice to the municipality.

5435. The Canadian Pacific Railway Company reducing its train service on its Crowsnest branch.

5436. Alleged excessive freight rates charged by the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway Company from a point in Alberta to Prince Rupert, B.C., as compared with rates on similar shipments from Vancouver Island, B.C., to Prince Rupert, B.C.

5437. Unsatisfactory train and mail service furnished at Picton, Ont., by the Canadian Northern Railway Company.

5438. Bell Telephone Company's rates in the vicinity of Lindsay, Ont., as compared with rates covering a like service at Oshawa, Ont.

5439. Refusal of the Edmonton, Dunvegan and British Columbia Railway Company to entertain a claim for suit case lost in transit from Edmonton, Alta., to Euniee, Alta.

5440. Freight classification on green wood. The weight of green wood being such as to cause a very high freight rate as compared with the rate on dry wood.

5441. Sectionmen in the West being laid off from duty and one section gang having a number of sections to maintain in repair.

5442. Wet condition of station grounds and vicinity at Ste. Anne, Man., on account of the overflowing of well and water tank belonging to the Canadian Northern Railway Company.

5443. The issuance of Canadian Pacific Railway tariff E. 2564 C.R.C. 2930, and Grand Trunk Pacific Railway tariff C.G. 83, C.R.C. No. E 3080 which propose certain increases on grain and grain products to points in the Maritime Provinces.

5444. Switching charges of the British Columbia Electric Railway and the Canadian Pacific Railway at Vancouver, B.C., over tracks owned by the Canadian Pacific Railway, but leased to the British Columbia Electric Railway Company.

5445. Freight rates on farm and dairy produce into Winnipeg, Man., over the Canadian Pacific Railway lines.

5446. Freight rates on macaroni from Lethbridge, Alta., to points in Eastern Canada.

5447. Lack of fencing along the right of way of the Parksville to Alberni branch of the Esquimalt and Nanaimo Railway on Vancouver Island, B.C.

5448. The Canadian Northern Railway Company not publishing a through rate on paper from Jonquière, P.Q., to points in the United States.

5449. Refusal of the Canadian Pacific Railway Company to entertain claim for potatoes frozen in transit from Spring Hill, P.Q., to Montreal, Que., although they refused to furnish a heated car for the shipment in question.

5450. Alleged inadequacy of service of the Canadian Pacific Railway Company's train from Toronto, Ont., to Hamilton, Ont., leaving the former point at 1.15 p.m.

5451. Refusal of the Canadian Pacific Railway Company to settle a claim for damage to a shipment of oats through heating while delayed in the Canadian Pacific Railway Company's yards at Fort William, Ont.

5452. The Canadian Pacific Railway Company charging the complainant for a 30,000 pound minimum 41 feet 6-inch car for a shipment of structural steel at Vancouver, B.C., although a 40-foot car was ordered and was as large a car as required.

5453. Alleged exorbitant freight rates charged by the Edmonton, Dunvegan and British Columbia Railway Company from Edmonton, Alta., to Swan River, Alta.

5454. The practice of engines being coupled to cabooses when assisting heavy trains over the hill east from Moosejaw, Sask., on the Canadian Pacific Railway.

5455. Removal of agent from station at Camden East, Ont., on the Canadian Northern Ontario Railway.

5456. The Canadian Northern Ontario Railway removing station agent from Newburgh Station, Ont.

5457. Freight rate on phosphate ore from points in the province of Quebec to destination in the United States.

5458. Lack of a proper shelter at Brookbury Siding, Que., on the Maine Central Railroad.

5459. The Canadian Pacific Railway Company removing agent from New Dayton Station, Man.

5460. Bus drivers, porters, and train runners of certain hotels in Winnipeg, Man., being afforded privileges at the Union Depot and Canadian Pacific Railway Company's station which are denied employees of other hotels.

5461. Refusal of the Grand Trunk Railway Company to entertain claim for lumber supplied by the complainants at Toronto, Ont., for the construction of car doors containing shipments of lime.

5462. Unprotected condition of a ditch constructed by the Campbellford, Lake Ontario and Western Railway Company along county road between concessions 2 and 3, township of Tyendinaga, Ont.

5463. Freight rates on granite and marble from St. George, N.B., to points in the west.

5464. The Canadian Pacific Railway Company losing baggage in transit to Hardisty, Alta., and then charging complainant for forwarding same to him from Calgary, Alta., where it was located.

5465. Unsatisfactory time limit allowed by the Canadian Pacific Railway Company on live stock shippers' return tickets.

5466. Condition of flag station at Middleport, Ont., on the Buffalo and Goderich division of the Grand Trunk Railway Company.

5467. Refusal of the Canadian Pacific Railway Company to pay transportation expenses incurred by complainant on account of failure of train to stop, when signalled, at Rosedale, Ont.

5468. Failure of the Canadian Pacific Railway Company to supply cars for the shipment of pulpwood and box wood from Clyde Forks, Ont.

5469. Freight rate on a car of corn shipped from Seattle, Wash., to Keremeos, B.C., over the Great Northern Railway.

5470. Inability to obtain settlement for services rendered ploughing fireguards between Rumsey and Morrin, Alta., on the Canadian Northern Railway.

5471. Refusal of the Great Northern Railway Company to make allowance of five hundred pounds per car on shipments of shingle at Salmo, B.C., to points in Ontario as specified in Great Northern Tariff 21757.

5472. Refusal of the Canadian Northern Railway Company to make settlement for a horse killed near Cardale, Man., where the railway company had dug deep holes on complainant's property and the horse wandered into one.

5473. Lack of proper drainage along the right of way of the Canadian Northern Railway Company in section 33, township 14, range 21, west of the principal meridian.

5474. The Canadian Pacific Railway Company failing to compensate complainant for property expropriated in the northwest quarter of section 31, township 20, range 9, west of the fourth meridian which they required for the construction of a "Y."

5475. The Canadian Pacific Railway Company's supplement No. 44 to W. 2866 which provides for an increase in rates from High River, Alta., to points on the Wilkie subdivision in the province of Saskatchewan.

5476. Unsatisfactory train service provided at Empress, Alta., on the Canadian Pacific Railway.

5477. The Canadian Pacific Railway Company's change of train service between Hardisty, Alta., and Wilkie, Sask.

5478. Unsatisfactory treatment received from the Grand Trunk Railway Company in connection with fire damage to property near Harriston, Ont.

5479. Locomotives of the Canadian Pacific Railway Company running out of Souris, Man., without being equipped with proper ash pans as required by the Board.

5480. Dangerous condition of public crossing over the Canadian Pacific Railway at Main Road between Spring Hill and Milan Village, Que.

5481. Unsatisfactory service of the Pere Marquette Railway Company on their line running through Corunna, Ont.

5482. Failure of railway companies in Canada to equip locomotives with safe and adequate facilities for reaching the headlamp when it is necessary to light or give other attention to this part of the locomotive.

5483. Insufficient lighting and lack of proper walks at Vulcan Station, Alta., on the line of the Canadian Pacific Railway Company.

5484. Condition of platform at Methven Station, on the Souris Branch of the Canadian Pacific Railway Company.

5485. The Canadian Pacific Railway Company's proposed increase in freight rate on brick from Balmoral to Winnipeg, and St. Boniface, Man.

5486. Refusal of the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway Company to pay complainant for constructing wharf on water lot No. 5 Prince Rupert Water Front, Prince Rupert, B.C.

5487. Freight rates on pulp and paper from Jonquière, P.Q., to Boston, Mass., U.S.A.

5488. Freight charges on a shipment of household goods from Picton, Ont., to Collingwood, Ont., over the Canadian Northern Railway Company's line.

5489. Train service of the Canadian Pacific Railway Company at St. Hughes, Que.

5490. Storage charges as shewn in the Canadian Pacific Railway Company's tariff No. W. 3296.

5491. Refusal of express companies to entertain any claims for damages to filaments of large metallic filament lamps when shipped under their care.

5492. The Canadian Pacific Railway Company issuing a notice that stock shippers must ship stock on specified days.

5493. The Grand Trunk Pacific Railway Company refusing to settle a claim for goods lost in transit.

5494. Alleged excessive freight rate charged on a car of lumber shipped from Lavant Station, Ont., to Westport, Ont., over the Canadian Pacific and Canadian Northern Railways.

5495. Switching charges on a car of brick shipped from Hamilton, Ont., to Tavistock, Ont., over the lines of the Toronto, Hamilton and Buffalo Railway and the Grand Trunk Railway Companies.

5496. The Canadian Pacific Railway Company charging excessive freight rates on a shipment of household effects from Liberty, Sask., to Bideford, Alta.

5497. The Halifax and Southwestern Railway Company raising rates on cream shipments.

5498. The Canadian Northern Railway Company not routing shipments, originating at Portage La Prairie, Man., and destined to points in the United States, as requested by the shippers.

5499. Refusal of the Canadian Northern Railway Company to make compensation for heifer killed on their right of way near Calgary, Alta., although the cattle guards at the point of accident were defective.

5500. Alleged excessive telephone rates charged subscribers of the Kerr Telephone Association for the telephone messages transmitted by the Bell Telephone Company between Foresters Falls and Cobden, Ont.

5501. The excessive duties of the Canadian Pacific Railway Company's station agent of St. Simon Que., and the alleged unfair treatment he is receiving from the company.

5502. Freight rates on pulpwood on the Temiscouata Railway Company's line.

5503. Alleged excessive freight rate on malleable iron castings in carload lots from Oshawa, Ont., to Fergus, Ont., over the Grand Trunk Railway Company's lines.

5504. The Hydro-Electric Power Commission constructing their power lines too close to telephone lines near Woodstock, Ont.

5505. Express rates on eggs from Smithville, Ont., to Toronto, Ont., as compared with the rates from Dunnville, Ont., to Toronto, Ont., the former route being handled by the American Express Company and the latter by the Canadian Express Company.

5506. The Canadian Northern Railway Company refusing to settle claim for horses killed on their line of railway near Munson, Alta., at points where their right of way fences are defective.

5507. Alleged discrimination shown by the Canadian Pacific Railway Company in the matter of freight rates between Winnipeg, Man., to Elkhorn, Man., and Winnipeg, Man., to Two Creeks, Man.

5508. Delay of the Canadian Northern Quebec Railway Company in handling live stock destined to the Quebec Provincial Fair at Quebec, Que.

5509. Refusal of the Canadian Pacific Railway Company to grant a refund on unused portion of ten trip tickets covering transportation between Montreal and St. Eustache, Que.

5510. Freight charges on a shipment of dried fruit from Fowler, California, to Bethune, Sask., the Canadian Pacific Railway Company asking for additional charges after complainant had disposed of a portion of the fruit.

5511. The Dominion Construction Company, contractors for the Campbellford, Lake Ontario and Western Railway Company causing damage to property at lot 49, concession 9, township of Camden, Ont.

5512. Alleged overcharge for the switching of cars between the wharves of Quebec Harbour and the Exhibition Grounds at Quebec, Que., by the Canadian Northern Quebec Railway Company.

5513. The practice of railway companies asking for additional freight charges that have already been delivered, paid for, and in some cases disposed of before this extra charge is assessed.

5514. Switching charges assessed by the Canadian Pacific Railway Company for switching service between Three Rivers, Que., to Wayagamak, Que.

5515. Refusal of the Canadian Pacific Railway Company to make settlement for goods lost in transit between Gladstone, Man., and Gull Lake, Sask., on the grounds that complainant signed a release and secured a low rate of freight.

5516. The Canadian Pacific Railway Company's change in train service at Tilbury, Ont.

5517. Freight rate on steel out of Moosejaw, Sask.

5518. The Grand Trunk Pacific Railway Company refusing to settle claim for horse killed on their right of way near Hulby, Alta., although they had no cattle guards at public crossing where the horse entered upon the track.

5519. No express service at Athens, Ont., on the Canadian Northern Railway.

5520. Alleged excessive freight rates charged by the Kent Northern Railway Company at Rexton, N.B.

5521. Treatment an inventor received at the hands of different railway companies in connection with his patent car coupler.

5522. Refusal of the Dominion Express Company to make a settlement for goods lost when put off at flag station at Mitford, Alta., where there is no caretaker or agent in charge.

5523. Proposed increase in freight rates on the Kent Northern Railway Company's line.

5524. The Canadian Pacific Railway Company for an alleged breach of the Canada Grain Act and bill of lading conditions in connection with a claim for grain short in transit between elevators in Fort William, Ont.

5525. Rates charged by the Dominion Express Company on bundles of newspapers shipped to agents along the Pere Marquette Railway to points between Walkerville and St. Thomas, Ont.

5526. The Canadian Pacific Railway Company employing only one man to watch twelve miles of its tracks in the County of Two Mountains, Que.

5527. Refusal of the Grand Trunk Railway Company to settle claim for horse injured on account of planking at Maitland Street crossing, Goderich, Ont., being removed.

5528. Freight rates on bog ore or natural oxide from Three Rivers, Que., to Toronto, Ont., over the Canadian Pacific Railway.

5529. Unsatisfactory service of the Adelaide Telephone System at Kerrwood, Ont.

5530. Alleged excessive freight rate on macaroni.

5531. Refusal of the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway Company to settle claim for oats lost in transit from Smithers to Houston, B.C.

5532. Freight rate charged on a shipment of settlers' effects handled from Hatzic, B.C., to Scott, Sask., over the lines of the Canadian Pacific and Grand Trunk Pacific Railway companies.

5533. The practice of the Canadian Pacific Railway Company in using steel and wooden coaches on the same train.

5534. The removal of station agent from Hemsford Station, N.S., on the Halifax and South Western Railway.

5535. The removal of station agent from Brookfield Mines, N.S., on the Halifax and South Western Railway.

5536. The Canadian Northern Railway Company for refusing to accept telegrams at their station in the village of Enterprise, Ont.

5537. Refusal of the Temagami Steamboat and Hotel Company, Ltd., to make refund for unused portion of round trip tickets.

5538. Freight rate on car of settlers' effects from Killam to Nelson, B.C., over the Canadian Pacific Railway.

5539. The Prince Edward Island Telephone Company ordering subscribers on a rural line to disconnect their telephones in cases where the instruments had been purchased from the Canadian Independent Telephone Company of Toronto, Ont.

5540. Charges levied by the Grand Trunk Railway Company for excess baggage shipped from Omemee, Ont. to Edmonton, Alta.

5541. Reduction in train service on the Wolseley-Reston branch of the Canadian Pacific Railway Company.

5542. The Canadian Northern Railway Company's proposed closing of Osaca station, Ont., or changing the present name of it.

5543. Express rate charged on a shipment of poultry from New York, N.Y., to Vegreville, Alta.

5544. Alleged discrimination shown by the Grand Trunk Railway Company in the matter of assigning fruit stalls in the old Western Railway station, Yonge street, Toronto, Ont.

5545. Alleged discrimination shown in the matter of freight rates on oil stoves, heaters, etc., manufactured in Sarnia, Ont., as against shipments originating in the United States to the same destinations.

5546. The Galt, Preston and Hespeler Railway Company not paying for right of way at Galt, Ont.

5547. Excessive freight rates charged by the Canadian Pacific Railway Company on settlers' effects shipped from Tyndall to Armand, Man.

5548. Proposed advance in freight rates on brick from Cheltenham to Toronto, Ont.

5549. General freight rates of the Canadian Pacific Railway Company in the vicinity of Fernie, B.C.

5550. Refusal of the Canadian Pacific Railway Company to settle for damages alleged to have been caused by them to property in the south half of section 1, township 9, range 10, west of the third meridian.

5551. Dangerous condition of highway along the tracks of the Canadian Pacific Railway Company just west of mileage 2.1 from Kamloops, B.C.

5552. Proposed increase in freight rates on cooperage stock.

5553. Alleged excessive freight rates on bituminous coal in carloads from the Niagara Frontier to Cheltenham, Ont.

5554. Delay in transit to a shipment of stock from Sinclair, Man., to Lockwood, Sask., on the Canadian Pacific Railway.

5555. The Bell Telephone Company refusing to comply with the terms of an agreement entered into with a subscriber at Bright, Ont., in connection with the installation and operation of an instrument in his home.

5556. Freight rates on woodpulp in carloads from Sherbrooke, Que., and Brompton-ville, Que., as compared with rates from Berlin, N.H., in the United States.

5557. The Grand Trunk Pacific Railway Company giving the wrong routing to a suit case shipped from Pocahontas to Edmonton, Alta., and eventually selling same when it was not called for.

5558. Refusal of the Canadian Pacific Railway Company to settle claim for cattle killed on their right of way although defective cattle guards were in use on their branch line from Mount Elgin to Port Burwell, Ont.

5559. The Bell Telephone Company refusing to install an instrument in a house at Aurora, Ont., unless subscriber pay portion of the cost for the poles to be erected to the house.

5560. Proposed increase in freight rates on newsprint paper.

5561. Proposed advance in freight rates on sulphur, in bulk.

5562. Proposed increase in freight rates on chemicals.

5563. Proposed increase in freight rates on clay.

5564. Proposed increase in freight rates on biscuits and confectionery.

5565. Proposed increase in freight rates on pottery.

5566. Proposed increase in freight rates on crushed stone, sand and gravel.

5567. Proposed increase in freight rates on canned goods.

5568. Proposed increase in freight rates on lumber.

5569. Proposed increase in freight rates on fruits.

5570. Proposed increase in freight rates on gin from Berthier, Que.

5571. Proposed increase in freight rates on iron and steel castings.

5572. Proposed increase in freight rates on coal and coke.

5573. Proposed increase in freight rates on western grain and mill stuffs shipped to eastern points.

5574. Refusal of the Canadian Pacific Railway Company to make a settlement of claim on a shipment made from Montreal, Que., to Vancouver, B.C., in the year 1909.

5575. Proposed closing of the Canadian Pacific Railway Company's station at Pointe au Chêne, P.Q.

5576. Present freight rate on shipments of hay from West Monkton to Cochrane, Ont.

5577. Proposed increase in freight rates on woodpulp, pulpwood, etc.

5578. Change in train service in the Thunderhill Branch of the Canadian Northern Railway Company in Saskatchewan.

5579. The Grand Trunk Pacific Railway Company discontinuing the operation of the Biggar-Battleford Branch.

5580. Proposed increase in freight rates on sugar from St. John, N.B., to points west of Montreal, Que.

5581. Proposed increase in freight rates on roofing material, wallboard and building papers.

5582. Lack of interswitching facilities between the Canadian Pacific and Grand Trunk Pacific Railway Companies at Wapske, N.B.

5583. The Canadian Pacific Railway Company proposal to cancel through rates on apples from Bay of Quinte ports via Brockville and Prescott to Montreal, Ottawa and Hull, P.Q.

5584. Condition of farm crossing at mileage 75·7, London subdivision of the Canadian Pacific Railway Company, near Drumbo, Ont.

5585. Hours of service and rates charged by the Bell Telephone Company at Eganville, Ont.

5586. Refusal of the Canadian Pacific Railway Company to entertain claim for furs lost in transit from Exeter, Ont., to Douglas, Man.

5587. Rates and classification of Epsom salts and Glaubers salt, packed in 200-pound bags.

5588. Freight rates charged on a shipment of oats from Russell, Ont., to Ottawa, Ont., by the Ottawa and New York Railway Company.

5589. Canadian Northern Railway Company's construction gang leaving large excavations on each side of the railway line at road allowance two miles north of the village of Leask, Sask.

5590. Damage to property on account of lack of culverts on the Prince Albert-Battleford line of the Canadian Northern Railway Company near Leask, Sask.

5591. Sectionmen of the Canadian Northern Railway Company removing planking at crossings on the Prince Albert-Battleford line of the Canadian Northern Railway Company.

5592. The Canadian Pacific Railway Company constructing a crossing on complainant's land in section 4, township 23, range 27, west of the third meridian, so that the public now travel his property.

5593. Refusal of the Canadian Pacific Railway Company to pay for leakage on a shipment of oil sent from Calgary, Alta., to Frobisher, Sask.

5594. Freight and passenger rates in British Columbia as compared with rates in the United States.

5595. Unsatisfactory service stock shippers receive for the handling of stock from Red Deer, Alta., to Calgary, Alta.

APPENDIX "B."

LIST OF APPLICATIONS HEARD AT PUBLIC SITTINGS OF THE BOARD FOR THE YEAR ENDING MARCH 31, 1915.

4780. Application of the corporation of the township of Edwardsburg, Ontario, to be relieved from participation in any portion of the cost of construction and maintenance of subway ordered by the board as per Order No. 18032, dated November 13, 1912, to be constructed where the G.T.R. tracks cross the road leading to Cardinal, Ontario. (File No. 9437·819.)

Order made amending Order No. 18032 by adding after the word "company" in the ninth line, the words "less ⅓ of such cost which is to be borne and paid by the village of Cardinal." See Order No. 21683.

4781. Application of the Toronto, Hamilton and Buffalo Railway Co., under section 178, for authority to expropriate certain lands in lot 8, con. 8, twp. of Pelham, Ont., said additional lands being required for traffic purposes, Canboro Road, township of Pelham, Ontario. (File No. 21620·13.)

Order made granting the application.

4782. Application of the Canadian Manufacturers' Association for a revision of section 3 of the Express Merchandise Receipt. (File No. 4214·390.)

Order made amending Merchandise Receipt as set out in board's Order No. 22973.

4783. The Canadian Pacific and the Grand Trunk Railway Companies will be required to show cause why the terms of the General Interswitching Order of the board should not be extended to the use of team tracks.

The board will also resume its inquiry into the local switching practices and charges, as set out in the Secretary's Circular No. 120 of July 30, 1913. (File No. 19801·70.)

See judgment of Chief Commissioner, dated April 8, 1914, Appendix "C."

4784. Application of the Cedar Rapids Manufacturing and Power Company, under section 178, for authority to expropriate for right-of-way for its transmission line, a part of lots 85 and 88 of a subdivision of lot 122, parish of St. Ignace du Coteau du Lac, P.Q., the property of Rev. Chanoine Dauth. (File No. 23677·48.)

Order made granting application.

4785. Application of the Cedar Rapids Manufacturing and Power Co., under section 178, for authority to expropriate for right-of-way for its transmission line a part of lot 7, concession 2, township of Cornwall, Ontario, the property of James Dingwall. (File No. 23677·53.)

Order made granting application.

4786. Application of the Cedar Rapids Manufacturing and Power Co., under section 178, for authority to expropriate for right-of-way for its transmission line a part of lot 31, concession 1, township of Lancaster, Ont., the property of D. Ross-Ross. (File No. 23677·59.)

Order made granting application.

4787. On a complaint from F. B. Mathys, of Montreal, P.Q., with respect to the minimum carload weight and variety of cars furnished for shipments, the railway companies to speak to the general question whether commodity tariffs carrying higher minimum carload weights than given in the Canadian Freight Classification should not be qualified so as to provide that when cars are loaded to their full space capacity are furnished the minima should be those of the classification, and "pro rata" for the excess. (File No. 19475·3.)

Matter stands pending consultation of the traffic officers of the railway companies with the Chief Traffic Officer of the Board.

4788. Complaint of the Ontario and Manitoba Flour Mills, Ltd., against the rates charged on grain milled at Sudbury and exported through the ports of New York, Philadelphia and Baltimore. (Adjourned hearing.) (File No. 1179-15.)

Judgment reserved.

4789. Complaint of the Canadian Lumbermen's Association against the proposed increase in local summer rates on lumber from Ottawa Valley points to Montreal, P.Q. (File No. 24195.)

See judgment of the Asst. Chief Commissioner, dated May 9, 1914, Appendix "C."

4790. Complaint of the Canadian Lumbermen's Association against the proposed increased rates on lumber to Montreal for export contained in the G.T.R. Supplement No. 51 to C.R.C. No. E-2318, C.P.R., Tariff C.R.C. No. E-2779, effective May 4, 1914, and C.N.R. Tariff C.R.C. No. E-419, effective May 6, 1914, suspended by Order No. 21621, dated April 9, 1914. (File No. 24195.)

See judgment of the Asst. Chief Commissioner, dated May 9, 1914, Appendix "C."

4791. Railway Companies will be required to justify the removal of the Essex Terminal Railway Company as a participating carrier in tariffs and supplements applicable to international traffic. (File No. 24129.)

Order made disallowing the tariffs and supplements in question. See judgment of the Chief Commissioner, dated May 4, 1914. Appendix "C."

4792. Application of Mrs. Kate Massiah for commutation rates between Lachute and Montreal also for improvement in the train service between the same points. (File No. 23865).

Order made dismissing the complaint. See Order No. 21889.

4793. Application of the C.P.R. Co., to Board for authority to take, without the consent of the owner, part of lot Cadastral No. 256 in the parish of St. Martin in the county of Labelle, in the province of Quebec, owned by E. Labelle.

Order made granting the application.

4794. Application of the city of Berlin, Ontario, under Section 279, for an Order restraining the Grand Trunk Railway Company from interfering with and obstructing public traffic on King Street West in the city of Berlin by reason of the shunting of its cars over the said street; also for an Order directing the said Company to remove its shunting and freight yard from its present position across the said street to some other locality. (File No. 23411.)

Referred to Board's Chief Engineer and Chief Operating Officer to take up the matter in question with the engineers of the city of Berlin and the Grand Trunk Railway Co.

4795. Consideration of the matter of grade elimination at the crossing of the Grand Trunk Railway Company at King Street, Berlin, Ontario. (File No. 23411.)

Referred to Board's Chief Engineer and Chief Operating Officer to take up the matter in question with the engineers of the city of Berlin and the Grand Trunk Railway Co.

4796. Consideration of the matter of grade separation at the crossings of the Grand Trunk Railway Company at Ahrens, Webber, Edward and Waterloo streets, in the town of Berlin, Ontario. (File No. 9437.20).

Referred to Board's Chief Engineer and Chief Operating Officer to take up the matter in question with the engineers of the city of Berlin and the Grand Trunk Railway Co.

4797. Complaint of the St. Mary's Horse Shoe Quarry, of St. Mary's Ont., against the alleged refusal of the Grand Trunk Railway Company to operate on their siding unless the Quarry Company pay for repairs made to such siding before the G.T.P. had any agreement with the Quarry Company. (File No. 24228.)

See judgment of Commissioner A. S. Goodeve, dated May 22, 1914. Appendix "C."

4798. Application of the T.H. & B. Ry. Company, under Sections 237, 238 and 239, for authority to divert highway between Concessions 5 and 6, lot 22, twp. of Gainsboro, Ontario, and to expropriate certain parcel of land connecting said highway with the highway between lots Nos. 21 and 22, concession 5, township of Gainsboro, Ontario. (File No. 23855.)

Order made granting the application subject to conditions set forth in the Order. See Order No. 21766.

4799. Consideration of the onus of providing an extension of the transfer facilities between the G.T.R. and Hamilton Radial Electric Railway Company at Burlington, Ont., on complaint of P. C. Patriarche of Burlington. (File 9614. Case 4666.)

See judgment of Chief Commissioner, dated May 23, 1914. Appendix "C."

4800. Application of the Hamilton Radial Electric Railway Company for an Order directing the corporation of the city of Hamilton, Ont., to make provision for drainage water caused by the filling in of Sherman Inlet and the construction of an extension of Birch Avenue from its northerly terminus to Gilkinson Street and for damages already caused. (File 17347.1.)

Judgment reserved.

4801. Application of the Grand Gypsum, Ltd., of Hamilton, Ont., for an Order directing the G.T.R. to construct a siding from its railway to the applicants' lands situate in the twp. of North Cayuga, Ont., being composed of the south half of lots 45, con. 1, north of the Talbot Road in said twp. of North Cayuga, excepting thereout that portion of the said lands conveyed to the G.T.R. Company; also complaint of the Grand Gypsum Ltd., that the G.T.R. have not complied with the Order of the Board No. 20819, dated November 14, 1911, authorizing the construction of this spur within two months from the date of the said Order. (File No. 22370.11.)

Board directed Railway Co. to put in stakes by the 30th April, the applicants to do the grading within two weeks and the steel to be put in by the Railway Co. within two weeks thereafter. Judgment reserved as to the apportionment of cost.

4802. Application of the G.T.R. under sections 29 and 176 for order rescinding Order No. 17562 authorizing the T.H. & B. Railway Company to construct a spur for the National Steel Car Company or in the alternative for an order authorizing the G.T.R. Co. to use and enjoy the branch line authorized by said order and have the same interests and rights therein and thereon as the G.T.R. Co. has upon jointly-owned spur, the construction of which was authorized by order No. 15294 with which the spur authorized by Order No. 17562 connects. (File No. 20519.)

Order made authorizing the applicant company to use and occupy the said branch line authorized to be constructed by the T.H. & B. Co., to the lands of the National Steel Car Co. If parties fail to agree on compensation the same will be fixed by the board. Order No. 17562 partially cancelled. See Order 21899.

4803. Application of the Hamilton Street Railway Company under section 227, for permission to cross the tracks of the Grand Trunk Railway Company (main line), on Kenilworth avenue, township of Barton, Ontario. (File No. 23753.)

Order made in terms set out in the judgment of the Chief Commissioner at hearing.

4804. Application of the corporation of the city of Hamilton, Ontario, for an order rescinding order of the board No. 21618, dated April 7, 1914, whereby the T.H. & B. Railway Company was authorized to construct a spur in the city of Hamilton, Ontario, into the lands of the Gillies-Guy Coal Company. (File No. 22581·9.)

See judgment of Chief Commissioner, dated May 21, 1914, Appendix "C."

4805. Application of Kerr, Thomson & Snider of Hamilton, Ontario, on behalf of property owners, to amend orders of the board Nos. 16671, 18906 and 20577 with respect to shunting by the G.T.R. on Ferguson avenue, Hamilton, Ontario.

NOTE.—Applicants will speak as to further order directing the railway company to take over properties at figures as found by arbitrators or the railway company reimburse property owners and an amount paid as damages for properties being brought within the scope of the board's orders from June, 1912, up to the present time. (File No. 18292, part 3.)

Order made dismissing the application. See order 21868.

4806. Application of the Canadian Northern Ontario Railway Company, under section 237, for authority to construct its line of railway across Main street in the village of Orono, township of Clarke, county of Durham, Ontario, at station 1274+35. (File No. 3878·106.)

No order made. Board's Chief Engineer to make an inspection and report.

4807. Consideration of the matter of protection of the crossing of the C.P.R. at Main street, Dundalk, Ont. (File No. 9437.1080.)

Order made in accordance with the judgment of Chief Commissioner at hearing. The village of Dundalk to first make its election with regard to Holland street.

4808. Application of Thomas H. Bickle, of the township of Darlington, Ont., under sections 252-253, for an order directing the C.L.O. & W. Railway Company to provide and construct a suitable farm crossing where the company's railway intersects his farm, being the north half of lot 35 in the first concession of the township of Darlington, Ont. (File No. 3701.367.)

Order made directing the railway company to fill in the sag in the creek crossing the applicant's farm with gravel and raise the grade at the creek 18 inches. See order No. 22215.

4809. Application of H. J. McPherson, of the township of Beverly, Ont., under section 226 for an order directing the Canadian Pacific Railway Company to construct a siding from a point on its main line to the premises of the applicant (stone quarry) in lot 32, con. 7, gore of Puslinch, county of Wellington, Ont. (File No. 22370.34.)

Order made dismissing the application. See order No. 21861.

4810. Application of the townships of Maidstone, Rochester and Tilbury West, and S. G. Millen, *et al*, under section 284, for an order directing the Michigan Central Railway Company to provide better morning train service into the town of Windsor, Ont. (File No. 21953.)

Board directed that train No. 109 be kept on until the railway company furnishes the board with statement and information asked for at hearing.

4811. Application of the London and Lake Erie Railway Company for an order authorizing a connection with the Michigan Central Railroad Company at the west end of the city of St. Thomas, Ont., and in the matter of order of the board No. 21513, dated March 16, 1914, authorizing this connection. (File No. 6713.56.)

Order made amending order No. 21513, dated March 16, 1914, by providing that the cost shall be paid by the Michigan Central Railway Company. (Order No. 21690.)

4812. Complaint of the Milton Pressed Brick Company, Ltd., of Milton, Ont., against the action of the Canadian Pacific Railway Company in holding up the construction work on their double tracking between Toronto and Guelph Junction, Ont. (File No. 22262.16.)

Application refused.

4813. Complaint of the Canada Foundry Company, Ltd., Toronto, Ont., relative to agreement between the applicants and the Michigan Central Railroad Company in connection with siding to structural steel plant at Shipyard, Ont. (Adjourned hearing.) (File No. 22327.)

Case struck off the list and not to be set down again for hearing unless either of the parties interested make application to the Board for that purpose.

4814. Application of the Ontario and Quebec Railway Co. (C.P.R.), under sections 222, 227 and 246, for authority to construct a spur from a point on the centre

line of its main line, east of Shaw street, Toronto, Ont., thence crossing at grade the tracks of the Canadian Northern railway, and crossing under the Toronto and Niagara Power Company's Power Line, to and into the premises of the National Cash Register Company situate in township lot 27, concession 2, from the bay in the township of York, Ontario. (File No. 22333.16.)

Order made granting the application subject to the conditions set forth in the order. See Order No. 21736.

4815. Application of the Byron Telephone Company, Ltd., under sections 355-360, for an order fixing the rates and tolls to be charged by the said Byron Telephone Company, Limited, and the Bell Telephone Company of Canada on the interchange of business between the said two companies and apportioning the same. (File No. 3839.9.)

Matter arranged between the parties. Settlement to be filed when order to go accordingly.

4816. Application of Sheldon's, Ltd., Galt, Ont., for sixth-class rating in Canadian freight classification in heating and ventilating apparatus in carloads. (File No. 19367.25.)

Order made dismissing the application but amending classification No. 16 as to item 38 on page 65. See Order No. 21969.

4817. Complaint of the Dominion Millers' Association and Canadian Manufacturers' Association against proposed rules governing milling-in-transit grain as published in Grand Trunk Tariff G.R.C. No. E-2765, suspended by Order No. 21590. (File No. 24130.)

Parties to endeavour to arrange the matter between themselves and with the chief traffic officer of the Board. In the meantime the case is struck off the list and not to be set down again unless complainant association requests it.

4818. Complaint of the Ontario and Dominion Sewer Pipe Companies against rate of 2 cents per 100 pounds charged on clay C.L. Waterdown to Mimico and Swansea published in Grand Trunk Railway Company's Tariff Supplement No. 146 to C.R.C. No. E-2552. (File No. 23913.)

Order made disallowing Supplement No. 146 to G.T.R. Co.'s special tariff C.R.C. No. E-2552, and rescinding the rate of half cent per 100 pounds. See Order No. 21746.

4819. Application of Maples, Limited, of Montreal, P.Q., for a rating of maple butter in the Canadian freight classification of 3rd class in less than carload, and 5th class in carload lots, or in mixed cars with syrup. (File No. 19367·30.)

Order made that the classification of maple butter be made the same as the classification of peanut butter, and that classification of maple cheese be included, the addition to be included in supplement No. 3 to Canadian freight classification No. 16. See Order No. 21745.

4820. Complaint of the Consumers Gas Co., of Toronto, Ont., against rate on coke Toronto to Buffalo, and application of the G.T.R. and C.P.R. companies for a readjustment of the coke rates. (File No. 23788.)

See judgment of Chief Commissioner, dated May 21, 1914. Appendix "C," and order made in accordance therewith reducing joint rate on coke in carloads of a minimum weight of 40,000 pounds, from 95 cents to 65 cents per ton of 2,000 pounds, effective 22nd June, 1914. See Order No. 21958.

4821. *Re* Albert street bridge work, Oshawa, Ont.

NOTE.—Board will hear objections of the town to details of the Albert street bridge plan. (File No. 3701.176.)

Judgment reserved.

4822. *Re* Operating Rules.

The Board will consider the application of the Michigan Central Railroad Company for the adoption of red and yellow as night indications on the rear end of trains instead of red and green. (File No. 4135·20.)

Michigan Central Railroad Co. agreed to adopt the Standard Regulations of the Board with regard to red and green lights. No order necessary.

4823. Consideration of the matter of plans of the Union Station, Toronto, the various questions arising out of Toronto Viaduct Order, including the questions of the construction of the York Street Bridge; and the appointment of the cost of the grade separation work at North Toronto. (Files Nos. 588, Cases 3322 and 2828 and Files 12021.70 and 9437.153.)

Order made declaring that the compensation to be made to the C.P.R. Co. for property actually required for subway and consequential damages resulting from construction of the subway as provided by the reservation set forth in clause 3 of agreement, July 29, 1913, between the C.P.R. and G.T.R. Cos. and Toronto Harbour Commissioners, and given effect to by Board's Order No. 19926, be borne and paid by the City of Toronto.

4824. Application of the Canadian Northern Ontario Railway Company, under sections 227 and 237, for authority to construct its line of railway with the C.P.R., and to construct a siding for Malleable Castings Company at Smiths Falls, township of Montague, Ontario, and to connect this siding with existing siding of the C.P.R., for Malleable Castings Co., and to cross Elmsley Street with said crossing. (File No. 23894.)

Judgment reserved. C.N.R. Co. to file a statement showing the public necessity for the connection.

4825. Application of the St. Lawrence and Ottawa Railway Co., (C.P.R.) under section 178, for authority to expropriate a certain tract or parcel of land, being lot No. 17 on the North side of McTaggart Street, in the City of Ottawa, Ontario, said lands being required for the enlargement of its Sussex street terminals. (File No. 24290.)

Order made granting the application. *See* Order No. 21762.

4826. The question of requiring further and additional smoke consuming devices and the amplification of existing orders with a view of abating the smoke nuisance at terminals will be considered. (File No. 6595, Case 3023.)

Matter referred to the Board's Chief Operating Officer to have report prepared. In the meantime judgment of the Board reserved.

4827. Consideration of the matter of plans of the Union Station, Toronto; the various questions arising out of the Toronto Viaduct Order, including the question of the construction of the York Street Bridge; and the apportionment of the cost of grade separation work at North Toronto. (Adjourned hearing.)

(File No. 588, Case No. 3322, File No. 588, Case 2828, File Nos. 12021.70 and 9437.153.)

Plans approved as set out in the oral judgment of the Chief Commissioner.

4828. Application of W. W. Vickers, Toronto, Ont., on behalf of Frederick C. Clarkson, of Toronto, assignee for the benefit of the creditors of the Dominion Grain Company Limited and Security Investments, Limited, and R. L. D. Taylor for an order directing the railway companies and other corporations interested in the acquisition of lands in connection with the Union Station, Toronto, Ontario, to immediately proceed with the expropriation by filing the necessary plans and appointing arbitrators to ascertain the value of said lands in accordance with the Railway Expropriation Act; or in the alternative to relieve the said lands from all direct or implied restrictions, and to enable said petitioner to deal with same in the open market. (File No. 588.30.)

Board decided no formal order need issue. Railway Co. to file the plan in the Registry Office by May 12th, 1914.

4829. Application of the Canadian Northern Ontario Railway Company for an order under section 159 of the Railway Act sanctioning and approving of the location of the Applicant Company's line of railway through the townships of York and Scarboro, in the County of York, Province of Ontario, from mileage 0 to mileage 7.60 from Yonge Street. (File No. 3878.532.)

Case struck off the list.

4830. Application of Frederick C. Clarkson, of Toronto, assignee for the benefit of the creditors of the Dominion Grain Company, Limited, and Security Investments, Limited, and R. L. D. Taylor for an order directing the railway companies and other corporations interested in the acquisition of lands in connection with the Union Station, Toronto, Ont., to forthwith proceed with the expropriation by filing the necessary plans and appointing arbitrators to ascertain the value of said lands in accordance with the Railway Expropriation Act; or in the alternative to relieve the said lands from all direct or implied restrictions, and to enable said petitioner to deal with the same in the open market. (File No. 588.30.)

C.P.R. Co. to file plan in the Registry Office by the 12th of May. No formal order necessary.

4831. Application of the city of Three Rivers, P.Q., for an Order directing the Canadian Pacific Railway Company to place gates where their line of railway crosses Bonaventure street, Three Rivers, P.Q. (File No. 9437-1088.)

Order made directing the C. P. R. Co. to install gates at St. Maurice, St. Thomas, and Bonaventure streets, in the city of Three Rivers; work to be completed by July 20, 1914; 20 per cent of the cost of installation to be paid out of The Railway Grade Crossing Fund; cost of operating to be paid three-quarters by the railway company and one-quarter by the applicant. See Order 21866.

4832. Application of the city of Three Rivers, P.Q., for an order directing the Canadian Pacific Railway Company to place gates where their line of railway crosses St. Maurice street, Three Rivers, P.Q., and to build a foot bridge at this point. (File No. 9437-1089.)

Order made directing the C. P. R. Co. to install gates at St. Maurice, St. Thomas and Bonaventure streets, in the city of Three Rivers; work to be completed by July 20, 1914; 20 per cent of the cost of installation to be paid out of The Railway Grade Crossing Fund; cost of operating to be paid three-quarters by the railway company and one-quarter by the applicant. See Order 21866.

4833. Application of the city of Three Rivers, P.Q., for an Order directing the Canadian Pacific Railway Company to place gates where their line of railway crosses Laviolette avenue, Three Rivers, P.Q. (File No. 9437-1090.)

Order made directing the C.P.R. to install and maintain at its own expense an automatic bell at the said crossing. See Order No. 21815.

4834. Consideration of the matter of protection at the crossing of the Dominion Atlantic Railway Company over the highway immediately west of the station at Waterville, N.B. (File No. 9437-955.)

Order made that the railway company employ watchman to protect the crossing in question. See Order No. 21134.

4835. Complaint of the Municipal Council of the County of Kings, N.S., against the closing by the Dominion Atlantic Railway Company of the public road leading from Cambridge, in the county of Kings, to Waterville, past the Presbyterian church, east of the station at that point. (File No. 9437-987.)

Order made directing the railway company to install an automatic bell at the said crossing by the 3rd September, 1914, 20 per cent of the cost to be paid out of The Railway Grade Crossing Fund and the balance by the railway company. See Order No. 22135.

4836. Consideration of the petition of the people of Grafton, N.S., and district, relative to the crossing by the Dominion Atlantic Railway Company of Grafton road. (File No. 14126-2.)

Order made that the railway company fill in the approaches to the said crossing, a distance of 300 feet to the south and 400 feet to the north, work to be done at the expense of the railway company. See Order No. 21921.

4837. Consideration of the matter of protection at the crossing of the Dominion Atlantic Railway Company at Port Williams, Nova Scotia. (File No. 9427-1120.)

Order made directing the railway company to employ a flagman to protect the said crossing. See Order No. 21900.

4838. Complaint of the Fredericton Board of Trade against the charging by the Canadian Pacific Railway Company of higher fares to and from Fredericton, N.B., than are charged to and from St. John, N.B. (File No. 23718.)

Order made directing the Dominion Express Company to publish and file a special tariff applicable to through shipments of milk or cream to Boston, Mass., upon the rates set forth in the order, tariff to become effective not later than July 1, 1914. See Order 21968.

4839. Application of the Farmers' Dairy and Produce Company, Limited, of St. John, N.B., for a workable rate on milk in carloads from St. John to Boston, Mass., by freight, passenger or express service. (File No. 23718.)

Order made directing the Dominion Express Company to publish and file a special tariff applicable to through shipments of milk and cream to Boston, Mass., upon the rates set forth in the Order, tariff to become effective not later than July 1, 1914. See Order 21968.

4840. Consideration of the matter of protection at the crossing of the Canadian Pacific Railway Company, West St. John subdivision, with the St. John Electric Railway on Main street, St. John, N.B. (File No. 2463.)

Order made directing that the crossing in question be protected by a half interlocking plant, subject to the terms and conditions set forth in the Order. See Order 21914.

4841. Complaint of I. E. Gillmor, of Second Falls, N.B., relative to fencing on the line of the Bay Shore Railway, now the Canadian Pacific Railway, in the vicinity of Donny River Station. (File No. 9994-100.)

Board decided that no order was necessary.

4842. Complaint of Noviciat de Notre Dame des Anges, P.Q., against the charge made for telephone service by the Bell Telephone Company of Canada. (File No. 3574-115.)

See judgment of Commissioner S. J. McLean, dated July 17, 1914. Appendix "C."

4843. Complaint of C. P. Newman, of Lachine Locks, P.Q., against the Bell Telephone Company's proposed increased annual charge for use of telephone on complainant's premises. (File No. 3574-113.)

See judgment of Commissioner McLean, dated July 17, 1914, appendix "C," disallowing the tariffs in question.

4844. Complaint of the Boards of Trade of Montreal, Ottawa and Quebec against the withdrawal of summer rates between Montreal and Ottawa, Montreal and Quebec, and intermediate points, also from Montreal to Grand Trunk stations Iroquois to Rideau, and Canadian Pacific stations Winchester to Smiths Falls, including Brockville and Prescott. (File No. 24223.)

Judgment reserved.

4845. Complaint of the Superior Sand and Gravel Company against the rate charged by the Canadian Pacific Railway Company on sand and gravel St. Gabriel, P.Q., to Montreal. (File No. 24180.)

Application dismissed.

4846. Complaint of Damasse Goyette, of Lemoyne, P.Q., relative to the action of the Canadian Pacific Railway Company in removing crossing in the vicinity of Iberville Junction, in the parish of St. Athanase, P.Q. (File No. 22734.)

Order made directing the railway company to provide and construct at the expense of the complainant a farm crossing, work to be completed by July 9, 1914. See Order No. 21959.

4847. Complaint of the township of Cleveland in the county of Richmond, Quebec, relative to protection at Jeffrey Crossing, G.T.R.

NOTE.—The matter of distribution of the cost of the work to be spoken to. (File No. 9437-943.)

Order made dismissing the application.

4848. Application of the Municipal Council of the village of Beauport, P.Q., under section 237, for two level crossings over the line of the Quebec Railway, Light, Heat and Power Company, in the village of Beauport, P.Q. (File No. 24071.)

Order made authorizing the applicant to construct two highway crossings over the railway. See Order No. 21863.

4849. Complaint of the village of South Durham, P.Q., relative to alleged dangerous condition of crossing (Bergevin's Crossing) on the line of the Grand Trunk Railway Company between Danby and South Durham, P.Q. (File No. 9437·1118.)

Order made directing the railway company to change the grade of the approaches to the said crossing to one in sixteen, the work to be completed by July 18, 1914. The cost of the work to be borne and paid by the railway company. See Order No. 21836.

4850. *Re* Overhead bridge over the tracks of the G.T.R. and Montreal Park and Island Railway at Lachine Road, Rockfield, P.Q.

(Note.) The Board will consider the claim of the various parties concerned to be compensated for the damages, if any, arising from the construction of the overhead bridge over the railway tracks at Rockfield, and the diversion of the Upper Lachine road, consequent upon the construction of such bridge, such damages to be included in the cost of the work. (File No. 9437·119. Part 2.)

Order made amending Order of the Board No. 10437 by providing that all moneys expended in the acquisition of any property required for the work, and all moneys paid in satisfaction of damages shall be considered as forming part of the cost of the work directed by the board's order. See Order 21853.

4851. Application of the Atlantic and North Western Railway Company, (C.P.R.) under section 237 for authority to construct at grade an additional track (double track) of its main line, Farnham subdivision across Champlain street, in the town of St. Johns, P.Q., at mile 19·9 of said line. (File No. 19855·20.)

Order made granting the application and rescinding Order No. 21714. See Order No. 21864.

4852. Application of the Cedar Rapids Manufacturing and Power Co., under section 178, for authority to expropriate for right-of-way for its transmission line part of lot 1, parish of St. Ignace du Coteau du Lac, P.Q., the property of Mme. D. Tremblay. (File No. 23677.38.)

Judgment reserved. Company to apply to the Department of Railways and Canals for approval of plan as mentioned by the Chief Commissioner.

4853. Application of the Montreal Light, Heat and Power Company for authority to lay a 30-inch gas pipe from new works on the Lachine Canal across the swamp presently under lease by the Grand Trunk Railway Company from the Department of Railways and Canals, Cadastral Nos. 1005, 1026, 1025, parish of Lachine, near the western end of Turcot Yards. (File No. 23918.)

Order made granting the application, subject to the terms and conditions set forth in the Order. See Order 22051.

4854. Consideration of the matter of the question of protection at the crossing of the Grand Trunk Railway Company at St. Ambroise Street, in the city of Montreal, [illegible] (File No. 9437.1100.)

[illegible]nds to be disposed of with the grade separation matter.

4855. Application of the city of Montreal, P.Q., under sections 29-52 and amendments thereto to vary in part the judgment of the Board made on the 18th of June, 1912, in connection with the application of the Chambre de Commerce of the city of Montreal to do away with all level crossings along the right of way of Grand Trunk Railway within the city of Montreal, P.Q. (File No. 24218.)

Judgment reserved. Parties to endeavour to reach a settlement. If not the Board will deal with the matter.

4856. Application of the city of Montreal, P.Q., to have the town of Verdun, the city of Westmount and the Montreal Tramways Company made parties to the application of the Chambre de Commerce, and that they be ordered to bear a portion

of the cost of track elevation of the Grand Trunk Railway Company's tracks in the city of Montreal, P.Q. (File No. 24218.1)

Application stands, the Board to visit the locus.

4857. Application of the Cedar Rapids Manufacturing and Power Company, to take lands in lot 332, the property of Maurice and Adolphe Tessier, in the parish of St. Joseph de Soulanges, P.Q. (File No. 23677.67.)

Struck off the list.

4858. Application of the Cedar Rapids and Manufacturing and Power Company, to take lands in lot 331, the property of Maurice Tessier, in the parish of St. Joseph de Soulanges, P.Q. (File No. 23677.52.)

Struck off the list.

4859. Application of Joseph Denis, of Montreal, P.Q., under section 226, for an Order directing the Canadian Pacific Railway Company to construct a branch line connecting his business premises with main line of the C.P.R. between Melrose Avenue and Belgrave Avenue, Notre Dame de Grace ward.

Parties to endeavour to settle the matter between themselves.

4860. Application of the Hepworth Silica Pressed Brick Co., Limited, of Hepworth, Ont., for an Order directing the Grand Trunk Railway Company to construct a spur to the premises of the Applicant Company at Hepworth, Ontario, and complaint against the switching charge of $2 per car proposed to be charged by the G.T.R. Company. (File No. 21428.)

Order made granting application.

4861. Application of the Corporation of the town of Aylmer, P.Q., for a reduction in the fare between Ottawa and Aylmer on the Hull Electric Railway. (File No. 21781.)

Order made dismissing the application. See Order No. 21905.

4862. Further consideration of the complaint of the Consumers' Gas Company of Toronto against the rates charged for the movement of coke within the Toronto group of terminals. Heard at Toronto, April 24. (File No. 23788.)

Order made granting the application.

4863. Complaint of the Boards of Trade of Montreal, Ottawa, and Quebec against the withdrawal of summer rates between Montreal and Ottawa, Montreal and Quebec, and intermediate points, also from Montreal to Grand Trunk Stations Iroquois to Rideau, and Canadian Pacific stations Winchester to Smiths Falls, including Brockville and Prescott. (File No. 24233.)

Stands. No action taken at present.

4864. Application of the residents in the vicinity of New Sydenham, Manitoba, for a road or approach to station at Layland siding, on the line of the Great Northern Railway Company. (File No. 2142.1.)

Order made directing the railway company to construct a good road allowance at south end of the station grounds, and to grade and level it to a width of 20 feet and put in proper condition the loading platform. Work to be completed by August 15, 1914.

4865. Application of Frank Yestrau, of Rosewood, P. O., Man., for an order directing the Canadian Northern Railway Company to stop their "flier" train at Dufresne, Man. (File No. 24100.)

Order made dismissing the application.

4866. Application of A. C. Belmer, of Dauphin, Man., on behalf of the farmers in the vicinity of Dauphin, Manitoba, for a siding or spur to be used for loading grain at a point about half way between Dauphin and Ashville, on the line of the Canadian Northern Railway Company. (File No. 342.3.)

Order made directing railway company to construct a grain loading siding between Dauphin and Ashville by September 1, 1914.

4867. Application of the town of Gladstone, Man., for an order directing the Canadian Northern and Canadian Pacific Railway Companies to construct a highway crossing over their lines of railway at Dufferin street, Gladstone, Manitoba. (File No. 24210.)

Order made dismissing the application.

4868. Application of the residents of Niverville, Manitoba, for an order directing the Canadian Pacific Railway to appoint and maintain a permanent station agent at that point. (File No. 20776.)

No order necessary, but the railway company must not remove the station agent without notice to the board, the town of Niverville and the Niverville Board of Trade.

4869. Petition of the residents of the village of Lac du Bonnet, Manitoba, asking that the C.P.R., company be directed to build a platform at a point opposite the village and have the local train stop at said platform night and morning. (File No. 19348.)

Order made refusing the application.

4870. Application of Charles Pritchard, Winnipeg, Manitoba, for an order directing the Canadian Northern Railway Company to ascertain the compensation due him for property lying between right of way and Jubilee avenue, being lot 32, block "C" plan 680 and for an order rescinding order of the board No. 19120, dated April 26, 1913. (File No. 20311.6.)

Struck off the list, railway company having arranged the compensation to be paid.

4871. Application of the rural municipality of Saint Andrews, Manitoba, under section 250, for án order directing the Canadian Pacific Railway Company, on its Winnipeg Beach branch to construct a suitable culvert under its tracks on each of the five following public road allowances:—

Road between river lots 103 and 104, parish of St. Andrews.

Road between river lots 119 and 120, parish of St. Andrews.

Greenwood avenue, town of Selkirk, Manitoba.

Road between sections 2 and 10-17-4, E.P.M., Manitoba.

Road between sections 15 and 22-17-4, E.P.M., Manitoba.

NOTE.—Board will consider the question of the cost of the work. (File No. 24151.)

Referred to the Board's Engineer for inspection and report.

4872. Complaint of Geo. Parks *et al*, of Winnipeg, Man., regarding alleged discrimination by the Canadian Pacific Railway Company between individual owners of automobiles and taxicab companies in connection with the conveying of passengers from the C.P.R. depot to different points throughout the city of Winnipeg, Manitoba. (File No. 23638.)

Referred to the Board's Operating Officer for inspection and report.

4873. Complaint of the Swift Canadian Company, of Winnipeg, Manitoba, that the railway companies refuse the dressed hog ratings of the Canadian freight classification to dressed hogs with the head removed and the backbone split. (File No. 19367.28.)

Struck off the list, matter having been settled with the railway companies by the complainant.

4874. Complaint of John Thomas, of Winnipeg, Man., of alleged excessive charges on cordwood from Richan, Ontario, to Winnipeg, Man. (File No. 23945.)

Order made dismissing the application.

4875. Complaint of the Canadian Industrial Exhibition Association of Winnipeg that the railway companies purpose this year to charge single fares for the exhibition round trip, instead of the lower fares, approximating 25 per cent less than single, charged during previous seasons. (File No. 24127.)

No order made as no further action necessary.

4876. Application of the Smart-Woods, Ltd., of Winnipeg, Man., for a ruling by the board as to liability of rail carriers under "Order" Ocean Bills of Lading. (File No. 23375.)

See judgment of the chief commissioner dated July 20, 1914. Appendix "C." Order made dismissing the complaint. See Order No. 22279.

4877. Complaint of James Auld, Winnipeg, Man., relative to train service of the Canadian Pacific Railway Company between Winnipeg and Lac du Bonnet, Man. (File No. 24302.)

Referred to Board's Operating Department for report.

4878. Application of the Tuxedo Park Co., Ltd., the Canada Cement Co., Ltd., and South Winnipeg, Ltd., under sections 176 and 317, for an order directing the G.T.P. Ry. to receive, forward and deliver upon and from the existing spur now serving the property of the applicants, situate in lots 60, 61, 62 and 63, in the parish of St. Boniface, and 1 to 11 in the parish of St. Charles, Man., upon such terms and conditions as the board may decide fair and equitable. (Adjourned hearing.) (File No. 15772.)

Judgment reserved. Board's engineer to furnish the board with a report in the matter.

4879. Consideration of the question of protection to be provided at the crossing of the Canadian Pacific, Canadian Northern and Winnipeg Joint Terminals railway at Provencher avenue in the city of St. Boniface, Man., and the apportionment of the cost thereof. (File No. 24178.)

No action taken, C.N.R. consents to pay the full cost of the watchman until the effect of the work is seen. The matter may be brought on again upon the C.N.R. asking another application for a revision.

4880. Complaint of the W. J. Guest Fish Co., Ltd., of Winnipeg, Man., in regard to the express rates charged on fresh fish in carload lots from Vancouver to Winnipeg, Man. (File No. 4214.436.)

See judgment of the Chief Commissioner dated the 12th October, 1914, appendix "C." Order made dismissing the complaint. See Order No. 22893.

4881. Application of the city of St. Boniface, Man., for extension of the express collection and delivery limits fixed by Order No. 19849, dated May 30, 1913. (File No. 4214.159.)

Order made fixing the limits for the delivery and collection of express freight and rescinding Order No. 19849. See Order No. 22231.

4882. Application of the city of St. Boniface, Man., under section 237, for leave to construct certain streets across the Emerson branch of the Canadian Pacific Railway Company in the city of St. Boniface, Man. (File No. 23395.)

Stands to be taken up by the city of Winnipeg with the Public Utilities Commission of Manitoba.

4883. Application of the Canadian Pacific Railway Company, under section 237, for authority to construct an additional track across Marion street in the city of St. Boniface, Man., on its Winnipeg to Emerson branch, Manitoba division. (File No. 21823.)

Order made for one additional track.

4884. Application of the town of Tuxedo, Man., for an order directing the Canadian Northern Railway Company and the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway to construct and maintain a suitable street crossing over their tracks where the same are crossed by or cross Kenneston boulevard, in the city of Winnipeg, and in the town of Tuxedo or the continuation of the same southerly, or authorizing the said town to construct such crossing and apportion the cost thereof between the said town, the city of Winnipeg and the railway companies. (File No. 23675.)

Order made granting the application. See Order No. 22909.

4885. Application of the rural municipality of Fort Garry, Man., for an order directing the Canadian Northern Railway Company to provide a proper and suitable subway under its tracks where it crosses Pembina highway, Winnipeg, Man. (File No. 20311.1.)

Order made dismissing the application. See Order No. 22102.

4886. Application of the Canadian Northern Railway Company for authority to remove the connection between the Canadian Pacific railway and the Winnipeg Joint Terminal tracks at Higgins avenue, Winnipeg, Man. (File No. 23815.)

Order made refusing the application. See Order No. 23177.

4887. *Re* Winnipeg Street Railway Crossing, crossing the Selkirk branch of the Canadian Pacific Railway on Selkirk Avenue and McPhillips Street, Winnipeg, authorized by Order No. 15449, dated September 15th, 1911, and crossing of the Canadian Pacific Railway spur of the Winnipeg Beach branch at Selkirk Avenue, Winnipeg, authorized by Order No. 21287, dated January 29th, 1914. (File No. 17610.) Application struck off the list.

4888. Application of the city of Winnipeg, Man., for an order directing the C.P.R. Company to take up and remove from and off Selkirk Avenue in the City of Winnipeg, a certain spur track which connects with the Selkirk branch of the C.P.R., immediately north of Selkirk avenue aforesaid, and runs southerly across Selkirk avenue into exhibition grounds, and to connect said spur with the said Selkirk line of the C.P.R., south of Selkirk avenue. (File No. 23122.)

See judgment of Chief Commissioner, dated October 30, 1914. Appendix "C."

4889. Application of the Canadian Pacific Railway Company under sections 222 and 237, for authority to construct a spur for the Dominion Lumber and Fuel Company in lot 38, parish of St. John, Winnipeg, Manitoba. (File No. 22318.18.)

Order made granting the application subject to the terms and conditions set forth in the order. Order No. 21267 rescinded. See Order No. 22835.

4890. Application of the Canadian Pacific Railway Company, under sections 222 and 237 for authority to construct a spur for the Dominion Lumber and Fuel Company in lot 38, parish of St. John, Winnipeg, Manitoba. (File No. 22318.18.)

Order made granting the application subject to the conditions set forth in the order. See Order 22835.

4891. Application of B. Shraggo, of Winnipeg, Manitoba, for an order directing the Canadian Pacific Railway Company to construct a spur to serve the applicant's warehouse in the City of Winnipeg, Manitoba. (File No. 22318.10.)

Order made granting the application.

4892. Application of the Canadian Northern Railway Company under sections 222 and 237, for authority to construct a spur for J. H. Carleton, to serve lots 24, 25 and 26, block 12, D.G.S., St. John, plan 12, Winnipeg, Manitoba, and to cross with such spur May street and Heaton avenue in the said city. (File No. 22318.19.)

Order made granting the application upon the terms set forth in the order.

4893. Consideration of the matter of construction of subway at the crossing of the Canadian Pacific Railway Company, at Salter Street, Winnipeg, Manitoba. (File No. 3084.)

Matter referred to the Board's Chief Engineer for report after conference with the city's engineer and the C.P.R. Co.'s engineer.

4894. Consideration of the matter of the request of the City of Winnipeg, Manitoba, for the construction of a subway at Talbot Avenue, Winnipeg, Manitoba, where it is crossed by the tracks of the Canadian Pacific Railway Company. (File No. 9437.279.)

Board directed that the City of Winnipeg could construct a subway at its own expense if it so desires, but that before the order is issued the city to advise the Board whether it intends to avail itself of the alternative referred to in the oral judgment of the Chief Commissioner. See judgment of the Chief Commissioner, Appendix "C."

4895. Consideration of the matter of the crossing of the tracks of the Winnipeg Electric Railway Company by the Canadian Pacific Railway at Logan Avenue, Winnipeg, Manitoba, authorized by Order No. 6501, dated March 12th, 1909. (File No. 8922. Case No. 4716.)

Order made dismissing application.

4896. Consideration of the forms of live stock contracts submitted by railway companies subject to the jurisdiction of the Board. (File No. 16749.)

Order to go under section 226 upon formal application and plans being filed and submitted for approval.

4897. Complaint of C. T. Rogers of Coleville, Sask., relative to alleged overcharge on car of settlers' effects from Broomhill, Manitoba, to Coleville, Sask. (File No. 24202.)

No order made. Board having no jurisdiction.

4898. Application of James McKay, M.P., *et al.*, for an order directing the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway Company to place a siding where their main line running into Prince Albert, Sask., crosses the South Saskatchewan River at St. Louis, Sask. (File No. 17913.)

Order made directing that the G.T.P. Co., provide and construct a ten car spur at Old St. Louis. Work to be constructed and completed by November 30th, 1914. *See* Order 22784.

4899. Complaint of the residents in the vicinity of Sibbald and Benton, Alberta, for an order directing the Canadian Northern Railway to construct a siding in section 6-22-2, W. 4 M., midway between Sibbald and Benton, Alta. (File No. 5891.8.)

Board directed that an Order go confirming the siding at the place where it now is. Board's operating officer to report in the matter of the platform.

4900. Complaint of the village of Hughton, Sask., with reference to lack of station and station agent at that point, on the line of the Canadian Northern Railway, in section 20-26-14, W. 3 M., Saskatchewan. (File No. 23717.)

Order made directing the C.N.R. to file a plan showing the location of a fourth class station at Hughton, to be erected and station agent appointed on or before the 1st of July, 1914.

4901. Application of the Board of Trade of Sheho, Sask., for an order directing the Canadian Pacific Railway Company to remove its station at that point to the town side of the track and thus eliminate a dangerous crossing. (File No. 23896.)

Order made dismissing the application.

4902. Application of the Grain Growers' Association of Wiseton, Sask., for an order directing the Canadian Northern Railway Company to construct a stockyard and loading chute at Wiseton, Sask. (File No. 24215.)

Order made directing the C.N.R. to complete on or before July 1, 1914, one open stockyard and loading chute at Wiseton.

4903. Complaint of the Landis Grain Growers' Association against the minimum weight charged on live hogs by the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway. (File No. 19475.5.)

Struck off list. To be dealt with in connection with general adjustment of the rate complained of.

4904. Application of the rural municipality of Viscount, No. 341, Sask., for a pipe crossing under the tracks of the Canadian Pacific Railway Company (Pheasant Hills branch), in section 29-34-26, W. 2 M., Sask. (File No. 965-17.)

Order made directing the railway company at its own expense to grade driveway from highway crossing and to install an eighteen-inch corrugated iron pipe, work to be completed by September 1, 1914.

4905. Application of the rural municipality of Viscount, No. 341, Sask., for an order directing the Canadian Pacific Railway Company to put the right of way of their Pheasant Hills branch in such shape as will allow farmers to deliver their grain at the elevators situated on the switch of the said railway in the village of Viscount, Sask. (File No. 965-18.)

Order made (see Appl'n R. M. of Viscount, No. 341, *re* pipe crossing under C.P.R., File 965-17.)

4906. Application of the rural municipality of Viscount, No. 341, Sask., for a permanent crossing at the centre of section 11-34-25, W. 2 M., where the present crossing is on the railway to the east of the hamlet of Plunkett, on the line of the Pheasant Hills branch of the Canadian Pacific Railway Company. (File No. 965-19.)

Order made dismissing application.

4907. Application of the rural municipality of Viscount, No. 341, Sask., for an order directing the Canadian Pacific Railway Company (Pheasant Hills Branch) to put their right of way in such shape as will allow farmers to deliver their grain at the elevators situated in the hamlet of Plunkett, Sask. (File No. 965-20.)

The railway company at its own expense to grade a driveway from highway crossing to elevator approaches and to install an eight-inch pipe, work to be completed by September 1, 1914.

4908. Application of the rural municipality of Viscount, No. 341, Sask., for an order compelling the Canadian Pacific Railway Company (Pheasant Hills branch) to place a pipe under their track opposite Block 4, of the hamlet of Plunkett, Sask., to allow the water a free course from the north side of the track to the south side of the same. (File No. 965-21.)

Order made directing the railway company to install an eighteen-inch corrugated iron pipe, work to be completed by the 1st of September, 1914.

4909. Application of the Board of Highway Commissioners for the province of Saskatchewan for approval of plan showing new road crossing over the right of way of the C.P.R., in the south half of section 29-34-26, W. 2 M., which road provides access to Viscount, Sask. (File No. 23124.)

Order made directing the railway company to construct a crossing at the point in question at its own expense, said crossing to be constructed by the 1st of September, 1914.

4910. Application of the Fiske Grain Growers' Association, for an order directing the C.N.R. Co., to extend the loading platform at Fiske, Sask. (File No. 17330.)

Order made. Railway company undertaking to have driveway and facilities attended to without delay.

4911. Petition of the Board of Trade of Minburn, Alta., relative to the station facilities of the Canadian Northern Railway Company at Minburn, Alta. (File No. 20214.)

No action taken. C.N.R. states that an agent had been appointed and that a fourth-class station would be erected within six weeks from the 29th of May, 1914.

4912. Application of the Board of Trade of Onoway, Alberta, relative to the train service of the Canadian Northern railway west of St. Albert, Alberta. (File No. 14942-175.)

Railway company stated that train service would be operated to Lac Ste. Anne, Alta., within six weeks from May 29. No order necessary.

4913. Application of the Board of Trade of Vegreville, Alta., for the enlargement of the stockyard and loading platform at Vegreville, Alberta, on the line of the Canadian Northern Railway Company. (File No. 24344.)

Order made directing the C.N.R. Co., to widen the loading platform at Vegreville to 20 feet by the 29th of June, 1914.

4914. Petition of R. H. Waite *et al.*, of Tofield, Alta., for station facilities on the line of the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway Company between Tofield and Deville, Alta. (File No. 19275.)

Order made directing the G.T.P. Co., to file with the board by 29th June, 1914, plan showing location of a standard No. 1A station, also a stock pen with necessary platform and loading chute, also a spur track to hold at least four freight cars; these facilities to be constructed and completed by September 1, 1914.

4915. Application of John A. McPherson *et al.*, of the village of Spruce Grove, Alta., for an order directing the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway Co. to operate and maintain, with good and sufficient accommodation for freight traffic, the railway station at Spruce Grove, Alberta. (File No. 17463.)

Order made directing the G.T.R. Co., to stop train No. 2 on Sunday morning at Spruce Grove and provide suitable track for handling of traffic from the platform and to make other provisions. See Order No. 22302.

4916. Petition of the residents of Gainford, Alberta, and vicinity, for an order directing the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway Company to appoint a station agent at Gainford, Alberta. (File No. 17275.)

No order made. The G.T.P. Company to file a statement showing its freight, passenger and express earnings from January 1 to May 31, 1914.

4917. Application of the merchants and business men of Ribstone, Alta., for an order directing the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway to have all prepaid freight in less than carload lots and express shipments addressed or consigned to Ribstone delivered there instead of at Dunn, Alberta. (File No. 22680.)

Order made approving of the location and details of station of the G.T.P. Ry. Co., at Ribstone, Alta. See Order No. 23060.

4918. In the matter of Order No. 21731, dated May 1, 1914, authorizing the G.T.P. Ry. to construct, maintain and operate ladder tracks across Kinistino avenue, in the city of Edmonton, Alberta, and directing that the switching movements over the said crossing be carried on between the hours of 1 and 2.30 o'clock p.m., and 9 o'clock p.m., and 4 o'clock, a.m., and application of the G.T.P. Ry. Company for reconsideration of the provision of the said order with respect to hours of switching, extending the time from 4 a.m. to 6 a.m.

Order made rescinding second paragraph of the operative part of Order No. 21731 and providing that the switching movements over the crossing in question be carried on between 1.00 and 2.30 o'clock p.m., and 9.30 o'clock p.m., and 6 o'clock a.m. Applicant company to provide watchman during switching operations.

4919. In the matter of protection at the level crossing of the Canadian Pacific Railway Company at Whyte avenue, Edmonton, Alberta.

(Note.) The board will consider the question of seniority at this crossing. (File No. 8464. Case No. 3935.)

Judgment reserved.

4920. Complaint of the Clover Bar Coal Company against 8 cent rate charged by the Canadian Pacific Railway Company on carload live hogs Millet to Edmonton, compared with 7½ cent rate for same movement when for packing purposes; also that the C.P.R. refuses to absorb any portion of the interswitching charges at Edmonton. (File No. 24342.)

Struck off the list.

4921. Application of the corporation of the city of Edmonton, Alberta, under section 237, for leave to construct a highway across the railway and yards of the Calgary and Edmonton Railway Company within the limits of the city for the purpose of opening up Athabasca avenue across the said railway and for the carrying of the said avenue under the said yards and railway by means of a subway. (File No. 22436.)

Leave granted to the city of Edmonton to appeal to the Supreme Court from the judgment of the board.

4922. Application of the C.N.R. Co., for permission to locate, maintain and operate a spur from a point on its authorized line in the city of Calgary at mile 255.40 to a point opposite block 48, to the property of the Canada Cement Company. (File No. 22398-14.)

Board directed that an Order go in accordance with the consent of the city of Calgary, dated May 26, 1914.

4923. Application W. W. Jefferson for the appointment of an agent at Junkins, Alta., on the line of the G.T.P. Ry., and for improvements to the station property. (File No. 20120.)

No action taken, the railway company having arranged for the installation of a standard loading platform at Junkins.

4924. *Re* transfer track in connection with C.N.R. and C.P.R. Companies at Calgary. (File No. 10821.95.)

See judgment of Asst. Chief Commissioner dated January 7, 1915. Appendix "C."

4925. Application of the C.N.R. Co., for an Order extending the time for the operation of the Gravelbourg branch until 1st October, 1914. (File No. 13975.156.)

Order made granting the application. See Order No. 22078.

4926. Application of the Massey-Harris Co., Ltd., for an Order directing the C.N. Ry. Co., and the G.T.P. Ry. Co., to construct a spur in block 6, Hudson Bay reserve as far as Athabasca avenue. (File No. 22140.)

See judgment of Chief Commissioner, dated July 8, 1914. Appendix "C."

4927. *Re* grade separation, Edmonton, Alta. (File No. 23420.)

Order made directing the protection of crossings of Syndicate and Albert avenues, city of Edmonton, by gates installed by the railway companies and operated by day and night watchmen. Detail plans to be submitted by the 7th August, 1914, and the gates to be installed within three months after the approval of plans. Provision made for payment 20 per cent of cost out of The Railway Grade Crossing Fund.

4928. *Re* time limit for the erection of gates on 1st, Alberta and Whyte avenues, Edmonton. (File No. 23420.)

Order made directing the protection of crossings of Syndicate and Alberta avenues, city of Edmonton, by gates installed by the railway companies and operated by day and night watchmen. Detail plans to be submitted by the 7th August, 1914, and the gates to be installed within three months after the approval of the plans. Provision made for the payment of 20 per cent of cost out of The Railway Grade Crossing Fund.

4929. *Re* protection on Spruce avenue, Edmonton. (File No. 19437.)

Order made granting the application subject to the conditions set forth in the Order. (See Order 21938.)

4930. Application of the city of Edmonton to open Morgan avenue, Regent street and Kelley avenue, across railway company's tracks. (File No. 23398.)

No Order made. Board is, however, of the opinion that if not at present certainly at an early date access should be provided to the property south and east of the Canadian Northern main line.

4931. *Re* crossing of 27th Street, Edmonton, by the Interurban Railway, and the G.T.P. Ry. Co. (File No. 20921.)

Board directed that Order No. 23634 should stand and that the Interurban Railway Co. be at liberty to renew its application as soon as the company is ready to operate its railway.

4932. *Re* crossing by the Edmonton and Dunvegan Railway Company at mileage 5. (File No. 24271.)

See judgment of the Chief Commissioner, Appendix "C." directing that an order will issue unless the anomalies referred to in the judgment are removed at an early date.

4933. Application of the merchants and business men of Ribstone, Alta., for an order directing the G.T.P. Co., to have all prepaid freight in less than carload lots and express shipments addressed or consigned to Ribstone, delivered there instead of at Dunn, Alta. (File No. 22680.)

Order made directing railway to construct station and one-pen stockyard. Work to be completed by September 15, 1914. See Order 22316.

4934. Application of the Grand Trunk Railway Company for an order amending order of the Board No. 138, dated June 17, authorizing the crossing by the Sarnia Street Railway Company of the Grand Trunk Railway (Point Edward-Blackwell branch) and requiring the installation of a diamond at the expense of the Sarnia Street Railway Company.

Order No. 21825, dated May 14, 1914, suspended pending hearing. (File No. 612.)

Board directed that an order issue but that such order be not retroactive. Grand Trunk to be furnished with a copy of the draft order.

4935. Consideration of the question of requiring further and additional smoke consuming devices and the amplification of existing orders with a view of abating the smoke nuisance at terminals. (File No. 6595, Case 3023.) (Recommendation attached.)

Referred to Board's operating department for investigation and report.

4936. Complaint of the Cowichan Ratepayers' Association on behalf of Adam Gordon, of Hillbank, B.C., relative to alleged inadequate culvert on his property on the line of the Esquimalt and Nanaimo Railway Company. (C.P.R.) (File No. 24270.)

Order made directing the railway company to file forthwith plans showing culvert to properly drain the lands of Adam Gordon. Work to be completed within two months from the approval of the plans. Mr. Gordon to contribute $50 towards the expense of the work.

4937. Complaint of the Cowichan Ratepayers' Association and others against the rate charged on grain and mill feeds from Midland points to points in the Cowichan district, B.C. (File No. 24271.) Judgment reserved.

4938. Complaint of the Cowichan Ratepayers' Association on behalf of L. C. Knocker, of Cowichan station, B.C., relative to refusal of the Canadian Pacific Railway to settle claim for case of eggs shipped to Mr. Knocker at Sechelt, B.C. (File No. 24272.)

No action necessary, the railway company having arranged to pay the claim.

4939. Complaint of Arthur L. Watson, Esq., of Duncan, B.C., relative to refusal of the Esquimalt and Nanaimo Railway Company to provide cattle guards at his farm crossing at a point one mile north of Tyee siding. Section 16-17-5, Lomenos district. (File No. 455.43.)

No order necessary, the case of the complainant having been removed in so far as the condition of the crossing is concerned.

4940. Complaint of R. P. Finlayson, of Okanagan Landing, B.C., relative to C.P.R. Company closing its crossing giving access to the railway station at that point. (File No. 21905.)

No order made. Board decided to visit the locus.

4941. Complaint of the Automobile Association of Victoria, Vancouver and Seattle, against the freight charge on automobiles between the Mainland and Vancouver Island. (File No. 24317.)

No action necessary the complaint having been withdrawn.

4942. Complaint of municipality of the city of Duncan, B.C., against the E. & N. railway crossing over the Victoria and Camphell River Trunk road, south of Duncan station. (File 9437.1143.)

Order made directing the railway company to install gates at the said crossings to be operated by day and night watchmen. The cost of constructing and maintaining the gates to be borne one-half by the railway company and one half by the city. See order 22817.

4943. Application of the Esquimalt and Nanaimo Railway Co. to amend Order No. 17221 authorizing the municipality of North Cowichan to construct a river road. (File No. 20209.)

Judgment reserved. Matter referred to the Board's chief engineer to report.

4944. In *re* the Esquimalt & Nanaimo Railway Co. and the Anderson Logging Company. (File 22196.) Order of the Board No. 21421.

Referred to the Board's engineer for report.

4945. Application of the Minister of Public Works of the Province of British Columbia for an order under section 237 of the Railway Act directing the Esquimalt and Nanaimo Railway Company to provide and construct for the protection, safety and convenience of the public, a level highway crossing at Alder Street, Riverside Townsite, Cowichan Lake, B.C. (File No. 24482.)

Order to issue in terms of letter of the Minister of Public Works, dated May 26 1914.

4946. In the matter of the location of Palmer Station on the line of the Esquimalt and Nanaimo Railway. (File No. 23838.)

Order made approving the location of the E. & N. Ry. Co.'s station at Palmer, subject to conditions contained in the said order. *See* Order No. 22944.

4947. In the matter of the blocking of the highway near Craig Station on the Esquimalt and Nanaimo Railway. (File No. 24570.)

Order made granting the application subject to the conditions set forth in the order. *See* Order 22535.

4948. Petition of the Ladies Club of Whonnock, B.C., the residents of Whonnock, and Maple Ridge Municipality, for an order directing the Canadian Pacific Railway Company to keep an agent at Whonnock, B.C. (File No. 20276.)

No order necessary, the railway company undertaking to see that freight and express are properly handled.

4949. Application of the C.P.R. Company for approval of plan showing the diversion of Boundary Creek and 20-foot masonry arch and proposed diversion of Government Road and 16-foot concrete arch at bridge 116.1, Similkameen Division, B.C. (File No. 22780.)

No order made, C.P.R. Co. to file an amended plan showing the work agreed to be done by the company.

4950. Petition of the residents of the District of Tynehead and vicinity for station facilities on the line of the Great Northern Railway at Tynehead, B.C. (File No. 23406.)

No further action necessary as counsel for the Great Northern Railway Co. stated that the station has been put in.

4951. Application of the City of New Westminster, City of Port Moody, and municipalities of Burnaby and Coquitlam, B.C., for a temporary level crossing over the tracks of the Great Northern Railway on the North Road, for the purpose of providing for the immediate extension of the British Columbia Electric Railway tracks for a distance along the North Road. (File No. 24332.)

Application withdrawn.

4952. Complaint of the Municipality of Burnaby, B.C., against the alleged overcrowding on cars on the Burnaby Lake Line of the British Columbia Electric Railway Company. (Vancouver, Fraser Valley & Southern Ry. Co.) (File No. 24312.)

Order made providing that the trains set out in the order shall carry in them the additional cars placed in service on the 5th June, 1914.

4953. Consideration of the matter of protection of the crossing of the Great Northern Railway Company at Burnette Street, in the City of New Westminster, B.C. (File No. 9437.973.)

Order made directing the railway company to install gates at Burnette Street. Plans to be submitted by July 10, 1914, and gates to be installed within three months after approval of plans. 20 per cent cost of Installation to be paid out of The Railway Grade Crossing Fund, two-thirds balance to be paid by Ry. Co. and one-third by City of New Westminster. Cost of maintenance to be paid two-thirds by Ry. Co. and one-third by City of New Westminster.

4954. Application of the V.V. & E. Ry. & Nav. Co., for authority to expropriate certain lands in the New Westminster District, part of the lands being required for

the purpose of diverting the Gunn Road and the Brunette Road and part for the purpose of providing an overhead crossing over the tracks of said railway company at the North Road; also for an order closing portions of the Gunn Road and Brunette Road; and in the matter of Order No. 19928, dated July 30th, 1913, directing the applicant company to construct a steel bridge over its tracks on the line of the North Road, etc. (Note.) This matter is set down to be spoken to for the purpose of fixing a time for the commencement and completion of the work. (File No. 573.33.)

Judgment reserved.

4955. Resumed hearing of the application of the residents of White Rock, Ocean Park and Crescent, B.C., for an order directing the Great Northern Railway Company to continue its summer round-trip week-end fares throughout the year between Vancouver and New Westminster and the said resorts, also that excursion fares be granted on public holidays between the same points, heard at Vancouver October 27, 1913. (File No. 23303.)

Application refused.

4956. Application of the city of Vancouver, B.C., under section 237, for an order sanctioning a highway crossing over the tracks of the Vancouver, Victoria and Eastern Railway and Navigation Company at Venables street, in the city of Vancouver, B.C. (File No. 24274.)

Order made granting application.

4957. In the matter of the Order of the Board No. 18593, dated March 3, 1913, authorizing the corporation of the city of Vancouver, B.C., to construct a bridge, to be used as a public highway, from Georgia street, in the said city, to Harris street, over the railways of the Canadian Pacific Railway Company and the Vancouver, Victoria and Eastern Railway and Navigation Company; and application of the Canadian Pacific Railway Company for an order directing the said city of Vancouver to bear and pay the expenses of an inspector to be appointed to protect the employees and regulate the handling of the traffic of the said company. (File No. 20060.)

City to pay the item now under consideration.

4958. Complaint of the cities of Vancouver and North Vancouver, B.C., against the change of plans by the Canadian Pacific Railway Company of the North Vancouver Ferry Pedestrian Subway. (File No. 9437-343.)

Order made dismissing the application. See Order No. 22808.

4959. Complaint of the city of Vancouver, B.C., for an order requiring the Canadian Pacific Railway Company to construct a tunnel connecting the Vancouver Front Yards with the False Creek Yards, in the city of Vancouver, B.C. (File 9437-873.)

Board decided that C.P.R. Co., should furnish the city of Vancouver with copies of the plans of the tunnel, and that any property owners interested should be allowed to inspect the same at the City Solicitor's office. That no movement of trains, except light engines and in cases of emergency, are to be made over the crossing in question between 11.45 a.m., and 1.30 p.m., and 5 p.m., and 6.45 p.m.

4960. Complaint of the Elmo Marshall Co., of Vancouver that the Canadian Pacific Railway Company's rate from Clayborn, B.C., to Vancouver, on condensed milk destined to Oriental ports, is excessive and discriminatory with respect to the company's rates from prairie and eastern shipping points of the same article. (File No. 24341.)

No action necessary the matter having been adjusted between the parties.

4961. Complaint of Mrs. Ella Scarlett-Synge on behalf of the Local Council of Women in regard to carrying of milk on freight cars by railway companies. (File No. 20119.)

Referred to the Board's Operating Officer for report.

4962. Complaint of the Hammond Association regarding the stopping of trains at railway stations. (File No. 22677.)

Complaint dismissed.

4963. Application of the British Columbia Express Co., regarding the removal of a temporary bridge built by the G.T.P. across the Fraser River. (File No. 19484.)

Application refused.

4964. Application of the city of North Vancouver that the C.P.R. be compelled to comply with the terms of the Board's Order dated 28th July, 1913. (File No. 13477·1.)

No action taken. Order No. 19815 lapses if the company do not proceed with the work.

4965. Complaint of certain property holders to any further delay on the part of the G.N.R. and the B.C. Electric Ry. Co., and the city of Vancouver in executing the work in connection with the viaduct in the east end of the city. (File No. 20062.)

See judgment of Chief Commissioner, dated November 9, 1914. Appendix "C."

4966. Application of the C.P.R. Co., for approval of its Port Moody and North Shore branch.

No action necessary as Order No. 19894 simply lapses if the company does not proceed with the work.

4967. Application of the City of Vancouver, B.C., for an order sanctioning the location of footings for the purpose of constructing the Dunsmuir Street spur, Canadian Pacific Railway Company.

Order to be settled between the parties and submitted to the Board.

4968. Application of the Board of Trade, Georgetown, Ontario, County of Halton and the Township of Esquesing, for an order directing the Grand Trunk Railway Company to provide and construct a suitable subway where said railway crosses "The Seventh Line" between concessions 7 and 8, said Township of Esquesing, Ont., at or near lot 20, concession 8. (File No. 9437.84.)

See Judgment of Commissioner S. J. McLean, dated July 8th, 1914. Appendix "C".

4969. Consideration of the matter of the Grand Trunk Railway Company crossings by the Berlin & Northern Railway in the City of Berlin, Ontario, and order of the Board No. 21780, dated May 7th, 1914. (File No. 23364.)

Board directed that a half interlocker be installed at derail of the electric and semaphore on the steam railway line to be operated by the Electric Co. at its own cost.

4970. Application of the Lake Erie & Northern Railway Company for an order amending Order No. 19087 approving the location of the line of railway from station 0.00 in the City of Brantford, Ontario, to station 298-53.5 in the town of Galt, Ontario. (File No. 18034.7.)

No action taken. No order necessary.

4971. Application of the Lake Erie & Northern Railway Company, under section 258, for approval of the location of station in the city of Brantford, Ontario, and the plans in connection therewith. (File No. 18034.60.)

Application refused. See order 22247.

4972. Application of the Grand Trunk Railway Company, under sections 237 and 257, for authority to renew the superstructure of Bridge 24, mile 76·9, Beford Street, Brantford, township of Brant, Ontario. (File 15487.10.)

Case struck off the list.

4973. Application of the county of Welland, Ontario, for the rescission of Order No. 20134, dated August 16, 1913, authorizing the Toronto, Hamilton and Buffalo Railway Company to divert the following highways:

Between lot 14, con. 10 and lot 14, con. 11, Township of Pelham.

Between lot 1, con. 13 and lot 1, con. 14, Township of Pelham.

Between lot 9, con. 11 and lot 9, con. 12, township of Pelham.

Between lot 5, con. 12 and lot 5, con. 13, Township of Pelham.

to close those portions of present road allowance to be diverted as aforesaid, within the limits of its right of way and to take lands from Alonzo Jennings, George Daboll, Thomas Toor, and Jemima Sutton. (File Nos. 21620.6, 21620.7, 21620.8 and 21620.9.)

Application dismissed. See Order No. 22357.

4974. Application of the Toronto, Hamilton & Buffalo Railway Company, under sections 221, 222 and 223, for authority to construct a spur in the City of Hamilton, Ontario, from a point on the applicant company's Easterly Belt Line of railway and running thence to and through the lands belonging to the Municipal Corporation of the City of Hamilton (City Sewage Disposal Works) and to and into the lands of Fowler's Canadian Company, Ltd. (File No. 22581.6.)

Judgment reserved for two weeks. Plan to be filed by the Fowler's Canadian Company, Ltd.

4975. Application of the Hamilton & Toronto Sewer Pipe Company, Limited, under section 225, for an order directing the G.T.R. Company to provide and construct a suitable siding where the company's railway intersects lands of the applicant company in the township of West Flamboro, Ontario. (File No. 22370.45.)

Case struck off the list.

4976. Complaint of Mr. A. C. Gahan, of Penticton, B.C., relative to damage or depreciation of property on account of location of the Kettle Valley Railway in lot 72, Penticton, B.C. (File No. 11730.88.)

No order necessary, the Board not having any jurisdiction.

4977. Application of the Kettle Valley Railway Company for authority to cross with its main line Vancouver Ave., Farrell Street, Lane, Victoria Ave., Gamble Street, Westminster Ave., Townley Street, Nanaimo Ave., Gamble Street, Fairview Ave., Road on the Pickering Subdivision, Lane (connecting with Creekside Road) Lane, Road along Creekside, Lanes, Haywood Street, Bekhardt Ave., Lane Street, Henry Street, Calgary Ave., Cassar Ave., Fairview Road, in the Town of Penticton B.C. (File 11738.82.)

No order necessary.

4978. Application of P. Coldron for an order directing the Kettle Valley Railway Company to compensate him for damage to his property on Main street, Penticton. (File No. 11738-97.)

No order necessary.

4979. Consideration of the matter of the Grand Trunk Railway Company's train service, Haliburton branch. (File No. 22117.)

Order made directing the G.T.R. Co. to establish a train service on the Haliburton subdivision of its railway, said service to be maintained for a period of three months from the 1st July, 1914. See Order No. 22055.

4980. Application of the Rocmac Road Corporation of America, Limited, Thorold, Ontario, for tenth-class rating in the Canadian Freight Classification on "Rocmac" in carloads. (File No. 19367-38.)

Judgment reserved. Stands for one week, parties to endeavour to arrive at a settlement.

4981. Application of the Standard Paint Company of Canada, for reduced rating on prepared roofing in the Canadian classification. (File No. 19367-35.)

Order made dismissing the application. See Order No. 22880.

4982. Railway companies will be required to show cause why, in view of the waiver in regard to secure packing as set out in the Companies' Special Contract Release of Responsibility, the said release should not be limited to damages connected with, or arising from breakage or chafing. (File No. 23507.)

Order made settling the form of release, being a form of special contract limiting the liability of the carrier in respect of the carriage of the traffic mentioned in the order. See General Order 136.

4983. Application of the Kootenay Central Railway Company (C.P.R.) under section 258 for approval of the location of station at Edgewater, mile 59·5 (south of Golden), B.C., on said Kootenay Central Railway. (File No. 1136-45.)

Order made granting the application subject to conditions set forth in the order. See Order 22137.

4984. Application of the Kootenay Central Railway Company (C.P.R.) under section 258 for approval of the location of station at Luxor, mile 54·4 (south of Golden), B.C., on said Kootenay Central Railway. (File 1136·44.)

Order made granting application.

4985. Application of the Kootenay Central Railway Company (C.P.R.) under section 258 for approval of the location of station near Athalmer and Invermere, B.C., at mileage 92 of said railway. (File No. 1136·13.)

Order made in accordance with the judgment of the Chief Commissioner.

4986. Application of the Wilmer Improvement Association for an order directing the Kootenay Central Railway (C.P.R.) to provide siding accommodation and station at Wilmer, B.C. (File No. 1136·50.)

Order made in accordance with the direction of the Chief Commissioner.

4987. Petition of the residents of the city of Columbia, B.C., against the proposed abandonment by the Canadian Pacific Railway of their station at that point. (File No. 21642.)

No action taken as no one appeared.

4988. Complaint of the Martin Prairie Farmers' Institute, of Pritchard, B.C., relative to train service of the Canadian Pacific Railway Company and application for the appointment of a station agent at that point. (File No. 23731.)

If necessary an order will issue upon the lines suggested by the Board's Inspector in his report.

4989. Complaint of F. W. McLaine, Mayor of Greenwood, B.C., against the proposed discontinuation by the Canadian Pacific Railway Company of daily passenger and mail service between Midway and Nelson, B.C. (File No. 24400.)

No order necessary, service having been restored.

4990. Complaint of the Mountain Lumber Manufacturers' Association and the Canadian Western Lumber Co., that the Canadian Pacific's lumber rates from shipping points in the Kootenay district and on the Crowsnest line are excessive and discriminatory compared with the company's rates from main line shipping points in British columbia to prairie points. (Re-hearing, following judgment in the general Western Rates Case.) (File No. 16177·1.)

See judgment of Chief Commissioner, dated February 9, 1915. Appendix "C."

4991. Application for the rescission of Order of the Board No. 16874, dated June 26, 1912, relieving the Canadian Pacific Railway Company from fencing and maintaining fences in so far as it affects the lands of Mrs. Fraser about one half or three quarters of a mile east from Revelstoke, B.C. (File No. 9994.64.)

No Order necessary. Matter referred to the Board's Operating Officer to inspect and report.

4992. Application of the C.P.R. Co. for approval of plan showing the diversion of Boundary Creek and 20 feet masonry arch and proposed diversion for Government Road and 16 feet concrete arch at bridge 116.1 Similkameen, B.C.

This matter is set down to enable Mr. J. D. McLean to make such representations as he desires. (File No. 22780.)

Railway Company to file an amended plan showing work agreed to be done.

4993. Complaint of the Farmers' Institute of the province of British Columbia, Revelstoke, regarding the condition of the fences and cattle guards along the line of the Canadian Pacific Railway on both sides of the Columbia River. (File No. 9994.145.)

Order made rescinding Order No. 16874 in part, as set forth in the Order. See Order 22635.

4994. Application of Mrs. C. M. Fraser, of Revelstoke, B.C., for a farm crossing over the tracks of the Canadian Pacific Railway one half or three quarters of a mile east of Revelstoke Station on the main line of the Canadian Pacific Railway.

Order made pursuant to provisions of Section 253 of the Railway Act, granting the application.

4995. Consideration of the matter of the first crossing over the Canadian Pacific Railway east of Herbert, Sask., and the present layout of the tracks at that point. (File No. 9437.978.)

Order made relieving the C.P.R. Co. from speed limitation imposed by Order 19500. See Order 22618.

4996. Application of the Craigmyle Board of Trade, Craigmyle, Alberta, for a station at Craigmyle on the Goose Lake Extension of the Canadian Northern Railway Company. (File No. 24291.)

Order made directing the Railway Co. to erect a third-class station at Craigmyle by the 30th August, 1914. See Order 22101.

4997. Application of G. B. Field, of Strangmuir, Alberta, for an Order directing the Canadian Pacific Railway Company to establish stock yards at Carseland, Alberta. (File No. 24373.)

No Order necessary, company undertakes to establish stock yards within one month.

4998. Application of the Rural Municipality of Mountain View, No. 310, on behalf of Mr. P. P. Dick, for an Order directing the Canadian Pacific Railway Company to provide an open crossing with cattle guards at the road in S.W.¼, Sec. 7-31-1, W. 5th M., Alberta. (File No. 618.53.)

Referred to Board's Inspector for report.

4999. Complaint of the Ross-Saskatoon Lumber Company, Ltd., of Waldo, B.C., relative to refusal of the Canadian Pacific Railway Company to continue their Waldo Branch down from Baker Lumber Company's Mill to connect up with the complainant's plant at Waldo, B.C. (File No. 24399.)

Order made authorizing construction of spur under Section 226 of Railway Act, to Ry. Co. to file by 22nd July a plan and to serve a copy thereof on the G.T.R., setting out the manner in which the proposed tracks of the Great Northern are to be crossed. Board's Engineer to make an estimate of the cost. Spur to be completed within 60 days after the amount has been deposited in the bank.

5000. Application of the city of Lethbridge for an extension of the Express Delivery Limits to include the City's Industrial Building. (File No. 4214.101.)

No Order to be made until the road is put in proper condition by the city, if any dispute arises in this connection, Board's Inspector to make report.

5001. Application of the Western Canada Stone Co., of Calgary, Alberta, for an extension of the express collection and delivery limits at Calgary, so as to include the applicant's plant. (File No. 4214.126.)

Order made dismissing the application. See Order No. 22093.

5002. Application of the City of Calgary, Alberta, for an Order allowing all poles in lanes in the city of Calgary, Alberta, to remain as they now stand in regard to clearance. (File No. 1750.79.)

Judgment reserved. Board to visit the locus.

5003. Application of the Calgary Board of Trade for an Order directing the construction of a spur on the Canadian Pacific Railway at Nightingale, Alberta, to connect the Canadian Pacific Railway lines with the Canadian Northern Railway lines for the interchange of traffic. (File No. 21181.)

Application dismissed.

5004. Application of Walfred Hornstrom, of Calgary, Alta., under Section 233, for an Order to determine compensation to be paid by the G.T.P. Branch Lines Company for damage to his property by raising of the level of the street in front of his property on Argyle Ave., or 8th Avenue East, in the city of Calgary, Alberta. (File No. 10821.96.)

Judgment reserved.

5005. Application of Rebecca Waters and John Cornfoot, of Calgary, Alberta, under Section 235, for an Order to determine the amount of compensation to be paid

by the G.T.P. Branch Lines Company for damage to their property by the raising of the level of Argyle Avenue or 8th Street East, in the City of Calgary, Alberta. (File No. 10821.97.)

Judgment reserved.

5006. Application of the Canadian Pacific Railway Company for authority to open for the carriage of traffic bridge at mile 0.7 Red Deer Subdivision (9th Avenue Subway) Calgary, Alberta, and application of the City of Calgary, Alberta, relative to material to be used for paving the subway at this point. (File No. 18228.)

Order made dismissing the application. See Order No. 22804.

5007. Application of the Calgary & Fernie Railway Company for an Order authorizing it to construct a line of railway from a point in Lot 8493 in Kananaskis Pass, thence running in a southerly direction to a point in Lot 4135, being from Mileage 0 to 63. (File No. 24165.)

Order made granting the application subject to conditions set forth in the Order. See Order 22172.

5008. Complaint of A. Low, of Calgary, that the Canadian Pacific Railway Company refuses him the privilege of chartering a train for a Sunday School excursion to Banff. (File No. 24305.)

Application dismissed.

5009. Consideration of the matter of requiring the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway Company, the Canadian Pacific Railway Company and the Canadian Northern Railway Company to establish interchange tracks between their respective railways in the city of Calgary, Alberta. (File No. 10821.95.)

Stands, the city of Calgary to put in written submissions and the railway companies to endeavour to reach a settlement.

5010. Application of the Railway Commission of Montana that Great Northern Railway trains Nos. 251 and 252, Michel Branch, run through to Kalishell, Montana, and connect at Rexford with main line trains Nos. 2 and 3. (File No. 23238.)

No Order necessary.

5011. Application on behalf of the town of Strathmore, Alta., for an Order requiring the Canadian Pacific Railway Company to stop trains Nos. 13 and 14 at Strathmore. (File No. 24635.)

Board decided that it would not be justified in ordering an increased service under present conditions. Complainants at liberty to renew their application again if traffic conditions should warrant it.

5012. *Re* C.N.R. and C.P.R. interchange tracks at the premises of the Canada Cement Company, Calgary, Alberta.

Order made in accordance with the joint recommendation of the Board's Asst. Engineer and Chief Operating Officer with the exception that the first recommendation be changed to make the centre thirteen feet instead of fourteen feet.

5013. Application of the Board of Trade, Stettler, Alta., for an Order directing the C.P.R., C.N.R. Companies to provide a suitable transfer track connecting their railways, pursuant to the Board's Order No. 15084, dated 11th Sept., 1911. (File No. 15800.)

Order made granting the application.

5014. Application of the Rural Municipality of Mountain View, No. 310, to open railway across the North and South road west of North West 19-31-1-5, and to close crossing on the east and west road north of North East 26-33-2-5. (File No. 21068.)

Order made granting the application.

5015. Application by G.T.P. Ry. Co., under sections 222 and 237 of the Railway Act, for an order authorizing the construction, maintenance and operation of two spurs for the Ferintosh Gravel Co., Ltd., and Inglis MacDonald and Thom. (File No. 22372.17.)

Order made granting the application. See Order 22146.

5016. Application of the city of Calgary and the Western Cooperage Co. under section 226 for an order directing the C.P.R. Co. to construct a spur to an industrial site Nose Creek, Calgary. (File No. 22398-16.)

Order made granting the application subject to conditions set forth in the order. See Order 22258.

5017. Application by the G.T.P. Ry. Co. for revision of order relative to station facilities between Tofield and Deville, Alta. (File No. 19275.)

Order made amending Order No. 21937 by dispensing with construction of stock pen.

5018. Application by the Atlas Lumber Co. and others for a direction fixing an earlier date for the reduction in freight rates on coal which is to be effective September 1, 1914. (File No. 18755-17.)

Board decided that all that was required is that the coal in question shall be shipped after July 1 and not used but held in storage until September 1, 1914.

5019. Application by the C.N.R. for approval of two temporary spurs to serve the contractors on erection of government terminal elevator at Calgary. (File No. 22398-15.)

Order made on consent granting the application.

5020. Application of the city of Calgary to vary order of the board No. 15308 under section 227 of the Railway Act. (File No. 15489.)

Order made authorizing C.P.R. to operate its trains over the crossing without being first brought to a stop. See Order No. 22908.

5021. Application of the city of Medicine Hat, Alberta, for the rescission of Order No. 19624, dated July 11, 1913, authorizing the construction of subway where the tracks of the Canadian Pacific Railway Company cross (Esplanade) River street, Medicine Hat, and for an order authorizing the construction of a subway where the tracks of the Canadian Pacific Railway Company cross Toronto street in the city of Medicine Hat, Alberta. (File No. 21979.)

Judgment reserved.

5022. Application of the Canadian Northern Western Railway Company, under section 237, for authority to construct its line of railway across the main line of the Canadian Pacific Railway Company in the city of Medicine Hat, Alberta. (File No. 23356.)

Order made granting the application.

5023. Application of the Medicine Hat Southern Railway Company under section 227, for leave to cross the Canadian Pacific Railway Company's line of railway (overhead crossing) between S.E. ¼, sec. 35, twp. 11, range 6, W. 4 M., Alberta. (File No. 24084.)

Order made granting the application. See Order No. 22358.

5024. Application of the Maple Leaf Milling Co., Medicine Hat, regarding local switching rates on brick. (File No. 24506.)

Application withdrawn.

5025. Application of the municipal corporation of the city of Medicine Hat for an order under sections of the Railway Act giving liberty to the C.P.R. Co. to operate one or more passenger trains on the railway known as the Ansley Spur from a point at the Junction of the C.P.R. Co. in the city of Medicine Hat to a point lying at or near the Exhibition Grounds in the city of Medicine Hat on the 1st day of July, 1914. (File No. 22576.)

No action taken. Referred to board's engineer for a report.

5026. Application for a spur from the C.P.R. to the Maple Leaf Milling Co's. plant in Medicine Hat. (File No. 22397-6.)

Order made granting the application.

5027. In the matter of applications under subsection (*e*) of the Board's General Order No. 65. (File No. 1750-18.)

The matter referred to the Board's Operating Officer to report.

5028. Application by the Canadian Pacific Railway to have Order No. 21821 varied by requiring the municipality to do the grading and to have the apportionment of the cost decided by the Board before the work is done. (File No. 8262-50.)

Order made directing the C.P.R. Co. at its own expense to acquire the land necessary for the diversion involved in the construction of the roadway required under Order No. 21821. See Order No. 22468.

5029. Application of the Grand Trunk Pacific Branch Lines Company under Section 258 for approval of station site and station at Lawson, mile 58, on its Moosejaw Northwest Branch, in Section 9-22-5, W. 3 M., Sask. (File No. 24118.)

Order made approving the location of the applicant companies station at Lawson. See Order No. 22118.

5030. Application of the village of Vibank, Sask., for an order directing the Canadian Railway Company to construct a permanent crossing on its line of railway at a point where a temporary crossing has been established in the village of Vibank, Sask. (File No. 2424-5.)

No order made. Company undertakes to have the road surveyed and the municipality to do the work at its own expense.

5031. Consideration of the matter of the first crossing over the Canadian Pacific Railway east of Herbert, Sask., and the present layout of the tracks at that point. (File No. 9437-978.)

Board directed that Order No. 19500 should stand until the building occupied by the Atlas Coal Co. is removed and the clearance post moved west 100 feet from the point where it now stands.

5032. Application of James Carr, Lakeview farm, Viceroy, Sask., for an order directing the Canadian Pacific Railway Company to construct a railway crossing on his property in the S.E. ¼ section 16-6-26, W. 2 M., Sask. (File No. 22131.)

Board decided that no Order was necessary and that no further action need be taken in regard to this matter.

5033. Application of the Board of Trade of Forward, Sask., for a re-consideration of clause 1 of Order of the board No. 21560, dated March 26, 1914, relative to the Canadian Pacific Railway Company's station at that point. (File No. 6713-28.)

Application to furnish freight, passenger and telegraph service refused, the railway company undertaking to complete the spur ordered by Order 21560 within three weeks from June 24, 1914.

5034. Application of the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway Company for re-consideration of Order of the Board No. 21858, dated May 22, 1914, relative to the application of the rural municipality of Caron No. 162, Sask., for an order directing the G.T.P. Ry. to reconstruct the highway crossings east and north of section 9, township 18, range 28, west of the second meridian, Sask. (File No. 16305-4.)

The question of construction of a crossing at the point in question, mile 8-5, to be taken up by the railway company with the Board of Highway Commissioners for Saskatchewan. Board to be advised of result.

5035. Complaint of the Board of Trade of Neville, Sask., relative to the train and mail service at that point on the Swift Current southeasterly branch of the Canadian Pacific Railway Company. (File No. 17157-18.)

Board decided that no order should issue for increased service at the present time as the Board felt that is would not be justified under present conditions in issuing an order.

5036. Complaint of the Board of Trade of Fort Qu'Appelle, Sask., relative to alleged lack of proper platform and freight shed accommodation at that point on the line of the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway Company. (File No. 22349.)

No order necessary, the company stating that the freight shed accommodations have been given and the platform repaired.

5037. Complaint of the Board of Trade and city of Moosejaw, Sask, relative to delay by the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway Company in completing its line to Moosejaw, and the erection of station there. (File No. 10863-62.)

No order necessary. Board's engineer to ascertain whether the layout is dangerous or not.

5038. Application of the Canadian Pacific Railway Company under sections 159 and 237, for an order approving location of its Asquith to Conquest branch from a point on Pheasant Hills branch near Asquith for 41·62 miles to a point near Conquest on the Moosejaw northwesterly branch, and for an order authorizing the applicant company to construct across highways mile 0 to 41·62. (File No. 18031-1.)

Board decided that the railway was not to be built along highway, the C.P.R. to file plans showing new location.

5039. Petition of the Saskatchewan Grain Growers' Association, Keddleston branch, of Keddleston, Sask., for an order directing the Canadian Pacific Railway Company to appoint a station agent at Keddleston, Sask. (File No. 21765.)

The company stated that an agent had been appointed, the board therefore made no Order in this matter.

5040. Application of the Helendale Gravel Company, Ltd., to use a spur track on the Canadian Northern Railway about 30 miles north of Regina, Sask. (File No. 22370.2.)

Order made granting the application. See Order 23170.

5041. Application of the city of Regina, Sask., for authority to proceed with the closing of Hamilton street where it crosses the C.P.R. in the city of Regina, in pursuance of the terms of Order of the Board No. 12801, and the construction of an overhead foot-bridge at this point. (File No. 999-1.)

Board decided no Order was necessary.

5042. Application of the Board of Trade of Regina, Sask., for a re-opening of the matter of the collection and delivery limits of the express companies in the city of Regina, Sask., as set forth by Order of the Board No. 21629, dated April 11, 1914. (File No. 4214-106.)

Order made that until further Order of the Board the tolls of the Express Companies shall include the collection and delivery of express freight in that portion of the city of Regina as set out in the order; also rescinding Orders of the board Nos. 14906, 21629. See Order 22374.

5043. Application of the Board of Trade of Swift Current, Sask., for an Order directing the Dominion Express Company to increase the area of the district served by them in the town of Swift Current, Sask. (File No. 4214-310.)

Order made extending delivery limits as set out in the Order.

5044. Application of the Board of Trade of Lawson, Sask., for an Order directing the Canadian Pacific and Grand Trunk Pacific Companies to install a transfer track between their respective railways in the city of Moosejaw, Sask. (File No. 6713-68.)

Application dismissed.

5045. Application of the Board of Trade of Yerwood, Sask., for a highway crossing over the tracks of the Canadian Pacific Railway. (File No. 21476.)

Order made upon the terms agreed to by the parties interested.

5046. Application of the town of Broadview, Sask., for an Order directing the Canadian Pacific Railway Company to provide and maintain proper drainage facilities for their shops, bunk houses, and works generally at Broadview.

Matter stands, the applicants to give in writing sections of the Act under which the Board can deal with this application.

5047. Application of the rural municipality of Sherwood, No. 159. (File No. 24495.)

No action taken.

5048. Application of the Vera Trading Company for an Order requiring the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway Company to construct a station at Vera. (File No. 24574.)

No Order necessary, the Company agreed to erect a standard shelter station building and a platform.

5049. Application of the rural municipality of Morris No. 312, for an Order directing the G.T.P. Ry. Co. to build a crossing across the main line of its railway about half way between miles 117 and 118 just west of the townsite of Zelma, and on the centre line running north and south through section 21, township 33, range 28, west of 2nd Meridian, Sask. (File No. 10795.66.)

Board granted permission to municipality to use the present temporary crossing until board's engineer makes a report as to whether a temporary crossing should be put in or not.

5050. Application of James McKay, M.P., for an Order directing the G.T.P. Co. to place a siding where its main line running into Prince Albert crosses the South Saskatchewan river at St. Louis. (File No. 17913.)

Order made in accordance with report of operating officer and assistant engineer.

5051. Application of the municipality of Viscount No. 341, Sask., for a pipe crossing under the tracks of the C.P.R., Pheasant Hills branch, section 29-34-26, W. 2 M. and for an Order requiring the railway company to put its right of way in such shape as will allow farmers to deliver their grain at the elevators situated on the switch in the said village. (File No. 965·17 and File No. 965·18.)

Order made directing the C.P.R. Co. to deepen the partially constructed ditch through the station grounds at Viscount to a depth of two feet and do certain other work as set out in the Order, work to be completed by Sept. 1, 1914. See Order No. 22075.

5052. Application of the G.T.P. Ry. Co. to be relieved from complying with Order No. 21653 (Zelma). (File No. 17605.)

Order made that railway company install an agent at Zelma. G.T.P. Co. to be treated as having now made an application for leave to discontinue on the ground that the returns only justify the employment of an agent during the shipping season, on which appeal judgment is reserved.

5053. Complaint made by the Board of Trade of Belle Plaine, Pense and Grand Coulee that trains Nos. 61 and 62 of the C.P.R. under the new time table taking effect May 28, 1914, no longer stop at any of these stations. (File No. 24479.)

Application refused.

5054. Application of the Board of Trade of Brandon, Manitoba, for an order directing the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway Company and the Canadian Northern Railway Company to establish joint terminals in the City of Brandon, Manitoba. (File No. 18030.)

Judgment reserved, Board to visit the locus.

5055. Application of the Manitoba Engines, Limited, for a commodity rate on pig iron from Port Arthur and Fort William to Brandon, in proportion to the rate prescribed in the judgment in the Western Rates Case to apply from the same points to Winnipeg, Man. (File No. 18755·12.)

No action necessary, the matter being covered by the judgment of the board in the Western Rates Case.

5056. Petition of the Grain Growers' Association of Storthosks and Nottingham, Sask., *re* train service on the Griffin branch (Lauder Extension) of the Canadian Pacific Railway. (File No. 3693·8.)

No order necessary, complainant to take the matter up with the railway companies affected.

5057. Application of the Carnduff Board of Trade and the residents of the villages adjacent to Frobisher, Sask., for an order directing that a transfer switch

be constructed between the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway and the Canadian Pacific Railway at Frobisher, Sask.

Order to go for transfer track unless the railway companies show cause to the contrary within ten days.

5058. Application of the Brandon Board of Trade regarding train service in and out of the city over the Canadian Pacific, the Canadian Northern and the Great Northern Railways. (File No. 24464.)

Application withdrawn.

5059. Application of the Middle West Federated Boards of Trade in conjunction with the Brandon Board of Trade as follows:

1. For a reduction in freight rates on coal from Fort William to Brandon and points in the district.

2. For a special commodity rate on news print from Ottawa to Brandon.

3. For a special commodity rate on pig iron from Fort William or Port Arthur to Brandon.

4. For a transfer track connecting the tracks of the Canadian Pacific and the Canadian Northern railways at Deloraine, Man.

5. That the railway crossings in the town of Boissevain and in the rural municipality of Morton be put into better condition and cattle guards re-constructed so as to afford more protection to live stock. (File No. 24465.)

Board decided that no order was necessary in respect to the various matters covered by the application.

5060. Complaint of the Grain Growers' Association of Harmsworth, Sask., against the Canadian Pacific Railway Company regarding station facilities on the Virden-McAuley subdivision.

No order necessary.

5061. Petition of the residents of Ethelbert, Man., and district with reference to the inconvenient and dangerous position of the Canadian Northern Railway station.

Referred to boards operating officer to take up with the railway company and report as to whether a satisfactory arrangement has been made.

5062. *Re* loading platform at Boissevain, Man. (File No. 24572.)

No action necessary, the complainants having arranged to take the matter up direct with the railway company.

5063. Complaint of Richard Euler, of Waldhof, Ontario, relative to train service on the Ignace subdivision of the Canadian Pacific Railway Company. (File No. 23922.)

No order necessary. Improved service having been put into effect by the railway company.

5064. Application of the Public Utilities Commission of Manitoba for an order permitting and defining the terms of certain proposed work upon or under the railway tracks of the Canadian Pacific Railway Company where they cross Portage ave. through lot 44 of the parish of St. James that is to say: (*a*) For the widening of the present passage or subway now under the said Canadian Pacific Railway Company, and now used by the Winnipeg Electric Railway Co., so as to permit of the construction of two street railway tracks therein, or (*b*) For the construction of a permanent subway for all traffic across the said C.P.R. (File 386.)

No further action necessary, pending the decision to be given by the Public Utilities Commission of Manitoba.

5065. Application of the Manitoba Sand and Gravel Company, of Winnipeg, Manitoba, under sections 315 and 323, for an order directing the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway Company to amend its Special Freight Tariff C.R.C. No. 279, dated November 21, 1912, as to item 10 on page 5, so as to provide an equitable rate on sand and gravel from Vivian station, Manitoba, to the city of Winnipeg, Manitoba. (File No. 5782-10.)

Order made dismissing the application.

5066. Consideration of the matter of construction of the subway at the crossing of the C.P.R. Co. at Salter street, Winnipeg, Man. (File No. 3084.)

Application granted, detailed plans to be filed by the City of Winnipeg, the cost of the work to be borne by the city.

5067. Application of the C.P.R. Co. under Sections 232 and 237 for authority to construct a spur for the V. D. Robinson & Sons, Ltd., in Parish Lot 37, St. John, city of Winnipeg, Man. Adjourned hearing. (File No. 22319-9.)

Stands to await the findings of Judge Robson upon the matter submitted to him.

5068. *Re* Winnipeg street railway crossing, crossing the Selkirk branch of the Canadian Pacific Railway on the Selkirk avenue and McPhillips street, Winnipeg, Man., authorized by Order No. 15449, dated September 15, 1911, and crossing of the Canadian Pacific Railway spur of the Winnipeg Industrial Exhibition along side the Winnipeg Beach branch at Selkirk avenue, Winnipeg, authorized by Order No. 21287, dated January 29, 1914. Adjourned hearing.

Struck off the list.

5069. Complaint of James Auld, of Winnipeg, Manitoba, relative to train service of the Canadian Pacific Railway Company between Winnipeg and Lac du Bonnet, Man. (File No. 24302.)

No action taken, pending the filing of any further submissions the complainant may desire to make in the matter.

5070. Application of the David Bowman Coal and Supply Co., Ltd., for an order authorizing the construction of a spur to connect with the Canadian Northern Railway at a point north of Oak Point, Man., thence eastwardly to the southwest quarter of section 18, range 4, west, to serve the applicant's company's lime kilns and quarries. (File No. 22370-65.)

Order made granting the application.

5071. Application of the rural municipality of Fort Garry, Manitoba, for an order directing the Canadian Northern Railway Company to provide a proper and suitable subway under its tracks where it crosses Pembina Highway, Winnipeg, Man. Adjourned hearing. (File No. 20311-1.)

Order made dismissing the application.

5072. Application of the Winnipeg Sandstone Brick Company, Ltd., for approval of spur crossing Pembina street, from C.N.R. siding on east side of the railway workshops to the Winnipeg Sandstone Brick Company, Ltd., on the opposite side of Pembina street.

The Blackwoods, Limited, and any other persons interested to show cause why the Blackwoods, Limited, spur should not be extended southerly to the premises of the Winnipeg Sandstone Brick Company. (Adjourned hearing.) (File No. 22434.)

Judgment reserved.

5073. Application of the city of Winnipeg, Manitoba, for a right of way (a wagon road) in the form of an overhead bridge or a subway across the new railroad yard of the C.P.R. Co., in connection with the Winnipeg transmission line, Kildonan, Man. (Adjourned hearing.) (File No. 1487-5.)

No order necessary.

5074. Application of the city of Winnipeg, Man., for an order directing the C.P.R. Co., to take up and remove from and off Selkirk avenue in the city of Winnipeg, Man., spur track which connects the Selkirk branch of the C.P.R. immediately north of Selkirk avenue aforesaid, and to connect said spur with the said Selkirk line of the C.P.R. south of Selkirk avenue. (Adjourned hearing.) (File No. 23122.)

Stands to await findings of Judge Robson upon the matter submitted to him.

5075. Application of the rural municipality of St. Andrews, Man., for an order directing the C.P.R. Co., to construct and maintain crossings over its tracks on lots 74 and 78, and for an order forbidding the company from removing or discontinuing the use as a station of its Victoria Park station on the Winnipeg Beach branch.

Order made authorizing the construction of the crossings at the expense of the municipality. As to the station at Victoria Park, the Board's inspector to report upon the matter.

5076. Application of E. C. Unger, for the extension of express collection and delivery limit of the express companies in Winnipeg so as to include Sherburn street to No. 638. (File 4214·145.)

Order made that until further ordered by the Board the tolls of the express companies operating in the city of Winnipeg shall include the collection and delivery of express freight in all thoroughfares reasonably passable for express wagons in that portion of the city of Winnipeg specifically set out in the order. Order No. 18413, dated December 31, 1912, rescinded. See order No. 22246.

5077. Consideration of the matter of the request of the city of Winnipeg, Man., for the consideration of a subway at Talbot ave., Winnipeg, where it is crossed by the tracks of the Canadian Pacific Railway Company. (Adjourned hearing.) (File No. 9437·279.)

Order made directing the city to construct a subway at its own expense, if it desires to do so. City to advise the Board whether it intends to avail itself of the alternative referred to in the oral judgment of the Chief Commissioner.

5078. Application of the Tuxedo Park Co., Ltd., The Canada Cement Co. Ltd., and South Winnipeg, Limited, for an order directing the G.T.P. Ry. Co. to receive, forward and deliver upon and from the existing spur now serving the property of the applicants. (File No. 15772.)

Judgment reserved. Board's assistant engineer to take the matter up with the interlocker engineer and report to the Board.

5079. Petition of the residents of the village of Lac du Bonnet, Manitoba, that the Canadian Pacific Railway Company be directed to build a platform at a point opposite the village and have the local train stop night and morning. (File No. 29348.)

Application refused.

5080. Petition of the Grain Growers' Association of Storthoaks and Nottingham, Sask., *re* train service on the Griffin branch (Lauder extension) C.P.R. (File No. 3693·8.)

No action taken, C.P.R. Co. agreeing to put into effect on September 27, 1914, new timetable which will give two trains per day over the entire branch.

5081. Applications on behalf of the town of Winnipeg Beach and the rural municipality of Saint Andrews for an order directing the Canadian Pacific Railway Company to restore the daily train service on its Winnipeg Beach branch and to discontinue the tri-weekly service of trains recently put into force.

No order necessary, parties having arranged matters between themselves.

5082. Consideration of the question whether, in assessing demurrage, the free time allowance for placement, customs entry, and unloading, under rule 2 of the Car Service Rules, should be combined or treated separately. (Application for interpretation by J. H. Ashdown Hardware Company, Winnipeg, and Canadian Freight Association, Winnipeg.) (File No. 1700·8.)

Application withdrawn.

5083. Application of the city of St. Boniface, Man., for the extension of express collection and delivery limits fixed by Order No. 19849, dated May 30, 1913. (File No. 4214·159.)

Order made granting the application and rescinding Order No. 19849. See Order No. 22231.

5084. Application of the city of Winnipeg, Manitoba, for the extension of the express collection and delivery limits in the Sixth Ward of the said city.

Board directs order to go in accordance with Inspector Shinnick's report.

5085. Application of the Canadian Oil Companies, Limited, for an order authorizing the construction of a proposed spur from the line of the Canadian Pacific Railway across Gordon ave. to the property of the Canadian Oil Companies, Limited, in the city of Winnipeg.

Order made granting the application provided the city is satisfied with the crossing over the street. Railway company to submit an estimate of the cost of the spur and the applicant company to be allowed a rebate of $2 per car.

Application refused.

5086. Application of the C.P.R. Co. for an order repealing Order No. 20808 dated January 7, 1914, and reinstating Order No. 20808 dated November 30, 1913. (File No. 23255.)

Order made refusing the application. See Order No. 22112.

5087. Application of the city of Winnipeg for an order requiring the C.P.R., the C.N.R., and the G.T.P. railway companies and the Great Northwest Telegraph Co. to remove from all the streets within a stated area all their poles, cables and wires and to place the same underground. (File No. 24557.)

No action taken. Matter to be taken up by the city of Winnipeg with the railway companies.

5088. Application of the city of Winnipeg for an order requiring the C.P.R. Company to construct a spur track from the main line of the C.P.R. (Nelson cut-off) to serve the applicant's gravel pit on the south half of the northeast quarter of section 5, township 12, range 5 E. (File No. 22370-33.)

Order made granting the application.

5089. Application of the rural municipality of Springfield, Man., for an order directing the removal of the spur track maintained by the Birds Hill Sand Co., over part of the road allowance between sections 23 and 24, and 25 and 26, 11-4 east and requiring restoration of the road allowance to the condition it was before the spur track was put in, or for terms and conditions of the continued user to be fixed by the Board. (File No. 5680. Case No. 2308.)

Referred to the Board's engineer to inspect and report as to the ditches, drainage, culverts and grade of the highways, the Bird's Hill Sand Co., Ltd., undertaking to have these put in proper condition.

5090. Application of the C.P.R. *re* proposed industrial tracks of the Winnipeg Paint and Glass Co. (File No. 22316-17.)

Supplemented order made authorizing construction of spur from the main spur.

5091. Application of the C.N.R. on behalf of the Builders' Supply Co., for an order under sections 222 and 237 of the Railway Act for an order to construct a spur through sections 12, 11 and 2, township 15, range 3, W.P. 11, mile 0 to 11-1.25. (File No. 22370.74.)

Order made granting the application. See Order No. 22242.

5092. Application of the Winnipeg River Co. to make connection on lot 26, mile 6, of the C.P.R. (Lac du Bonnet branch), for a spur out to the gravel pit of the Winnipeg River Railway Company. (File No. 6713-77.)

A formal application to be filed by the applicant company and plans to be submitted to the Board's engineer when, if satisfactory, an order will issue under section 226 of the Act.

5093. Application of the C.N.R. to remove the connection between the C.P.R. and the railway of the Winnipeg joint terminals at Higgins avenue in the city of Winnipeg. (File No. 23015.)

Order made refusing the application, the Sawyer-Massey Co., Ltd., the Dysen Co., Ltd., the J. H. Ashdown Hardware Co., Ltd., the Wilkinson-Kompass, Ltd., to continue to have switching from the C.P.R. Co. See Order 23177.

5094. Application of the municipality of the township of Oliver, Ontario, for an order directing the Canadian Pacific Railway Company to provide a crossing over its line of railway at the main road between lots 4 and 5, township of Oliver, Ontario. (File No. 23569.)

Order made directing the railway company to provide a crossing, the cost to be borne one-half by the railway company and one-half by the municipality.

5095. Complaint of the township of Oliver, Ontario, relative to alleged inadequate train service furnished by the Canadian Pacific Railway Company at Murillo, Ontario. (File No. 5638.)

Order made directing the C.P.R. Co. to stop its train No. 3 on flag signal at Murillo station, the company to be at liberty to cancel the present arrangement of stopping trains 7 and 11 at said station. See Order 22457.

5096. Application of the municipality of Neebing, district of Thunder Bay, Ontario, for an order opening up the proceedings which may have been taken by the Canadian Pacific Railway Company in connection with the construction by the railway company of highway crossing across the 20th side line, township of Neebing, Ontario. (File No. 24233.)

No order necessary, the railway company undertaking to do the necessary work at once.

5097. Complaint of the city of Fort William, Ont., and property owners, relative to the condition of the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway on Empire avenue, Fort William, Ontario. (File No. 22435.)

Order made that the speed of all trains operated by the railway company along Empire avenue in the city of Fort William be limited to a rate not exceeding six miles an hour. See order 22660.

5098. Application of the city of Fort William, Ont., et al, under sections 226 and 227, for an Order directing the C.P.R. to provide a spur from its main line in the city of Fort William along Neebing avenue, crossing the C.N.R. at grade, and street railway and highway at Montreal street, so as to connect with spur to the industries of the applicants; also for an Order allowing the spur to be constructed across the G.T.P. Ry. branch line on Montreal street.

(Note.) Board will consider representations of parties interested as to payment of additional cost in connection with construction of this spur. (File No. 19669, part 2.)

Parties to come together and arrange the matter and to write the board.

5099. Application of the city of Fort William, Ont., under sections 227, 235 and 243, for an Order permitting the city to cross the tracks of the C.P.R., C.N.R. and G.T.P. Rys. with its street railway where such tracks cross Heath street and Montreal street in the city of Fort William, Ontario, and for an Order repealing or amending Order No. 11330 and for an Order to compel the said railway companies to provide protection at all of the highway crossings of said railways aforesaid on Heath street and Montreal street and in each case to proportion the costs of construction and maintenance thereof among the interested parties. (File No. 22479.)

Stands until the city requests it to be brought on again.

5100. Application of the Canadian Pacific Railway Company under section 29 for an Order:—

(*a*) Amending Order No. 18457, dated December 30th, 1912, and issued on the application of the applicant company for authority to construct four extra tracks across May and Ridgeway streets in the city of Fort William, Ontario, by striking out paragraph 3 of the said Order and making other provisions for the fixing of the compensation, if any, which may be possible to the owner of the lot 32, and

(*b*) Rescinding Order No. 20917, dated November 29, 1913, and issued in connection with the same matter. (File No. 20538.)

No Order made, the matter having been settled between the parties.

5101. Complaint of the city of Fort William, Ont., that the Canadian Pacific Railway Company have taken up the tracks of the street railway where it is crossed by the spur authorized to be constructed by the C.P.R. to the premises of the Starch Works at 6th street, Fort William, Ontario. (File No. 22317-11.)

Struck off list.

5102. Application of the city of Port Arthur, Ont., for a re-hearing of the application of the Canadian Northern Railway Company for approval of its location through the city of Port Arthur, Ontario. (Adjourned hearing.) (File No. 9188-26.)

No further tracks are to be allowed to be laid and no Order approving tracks to be made by the board until full notice has been given to the city of Port Arthur and cognizance must be taken of the agreement of March 13, 1914.

5103. Application of the Canadian Northern Railway Company, under sections 222, 228 and 237, for authority to build a spur at Fort William, near Arthur street crossing, across lot 3, con. 3, twp. of Neebing, and along a lane between Arthur and Sills streets to west limit of property of St. Joseph school, a distance of 1,785 feet, crossing Arthur, Brunswick and Selkirk streets.

(Note.) The board will consider the matter of compensation for lands of the late Mrs. Sills across which the spur track has been constructed. (File 16351.)

Application dismissed.

5104. Application of the G.T.P. Railway Company, under sections 222, 237 and 257, for authority to construct a double track branch line or spur turning out from its line on Empire avenue, northerly along private right of way, formerly James street to William street, thence easterly to Thunder Bay, Fort William, Ontario. (Adjourned hearing.) (File No. 22317-1.)

Order made allowing G.T.P. Ry. to get to the government elevator as directed in the judgment of the Chief Commissioner.

5105. Application of the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway Company, under section 227, for an Order authorizing the construction of its proposed spur in William street, Fort William, Ontario, across the line of the Canadian Pacific Railway. (File No. 22317-2).

Application dismissed without prejudice to the applicant company to renew at any time.

5106. Application of the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway Company, under section 237, for an Order authorizing the construction of its proposed spur in William street, Fort William, Ontario, across the Port Arthur & Fort William Electric Railway. (File No. 22317-3.)

Application dismissed without prejudice to the applicant company to renew at any time.

5107. Application of the G.T.P. Ry. under section 227, for authority to construct a spur on William street, Fort William, Ontario, across the line of the Canadian Northern Railway Company. (File No. 22317-4.)

Application dismissed without prejudice to the applicant company to renew at any time.

5108. Consideration of the resolution of the ratepayers of the city of Fort William, Ontario, in regard to the proposed location of the C.N.O. Railway Company's station in Fort William; the question of protection at line crossings; and of the discontinuance of the main line traffic on the loop line. (File No. 5791.)

Judgment reserved, the board to visit the locus.

5109. Consideration of the matter of right of way over the Canadian Pacific railway and other railways to cross the Canadian Northern railway property at Port Arthur to connect with government elevator, also connection with the Canadian Northern railway at that point. (File No. 21826.)

Application dismissed without prejudice to the applicant company to renew the application at any time.

5110. Application of the Canadian Pacific Railway Company under section 29 for an Order varying Order No. 18457 dated 30th December, 1912, by substituting the following description of the lands to be conveyed by the applicant company to the city of Fort William for the description contained in paragraph one of said Order.

> All and singular that certain parcel or tract of land situate and lying within the city of Fort William, township of Neebing, province of Ontario, and being

a part of lot (31), fronting on May street, according to plan of subdivision of part of McKellar farm, registered in the registry office for the district of Thunder Bay, as plan No. 93, which parcel may be more particularly described as follows:—

Commencing at the northeast corner of said lot 31 thence south along the east boundary of said lot, a distance of fifty-six feet and four-tenths of a foot (56′ 4), thence south thirty-nine degrees and no minutes (S. 39° 00′ W.) a distance of twenty-seven feet and eighty-three-hundredths of a foot (27′ 83), to the south boundary of said lot 31, thence south eighty-nine degrees and fifty-five minutes west (S. 89° 55′ W.), a distance of eighty-two feet and four-tenths of a foot (82′ 4) to an iron pipe marking the southwest corner of said lot 31, thence north fifty-one degrees and fifty-seven minutes east (N. 51° 57′ E.), a distance of one hundred and twenty-six feet and eighty-five-hundredths of a foot (126·85′) to the point of beginning.

Said parcel containing by admeasurement eighty-five-thousandths of an acre (0·085 acres), be it more or less. (File No. 20538.)

No Order made, the matter having been settled between the parties.

5111. *Re* road crossing between concessions 15 and 16, twp. of Neebing where it crosses the C.P.R. Co.'s line. (File No. 24652.)

Board decided that if there has been any interference with the road by the C.P.R., the company is to be required to put it right without delay.

5112. *Re* re-arrangement of spur track connecting with the C.N.R. across Franklin street and to place the same across Mark street, Fort William. (File No. 24576.)

Order made granting the application. See Order No. 22223.

5113. Application of Joseph and Arthur Brunet, of Chelmsford, Ontario, for a reduction in the rate on hay, carloads, from Chelmsford to Fort William and Port Arthur, Ontario. (File No. 23704.)

No action taken. Matter stands for such written submissions as the applicants may desire to file with the board.

5114. Application of the municipal council of the town of Sudbury, Ontario, for an Order directing the Canadian Pacific Railway Company to install some system of protection on main line crossing Elm street, Sudbury, Ont. (File No. 9437·1066.)

Board decided that no order should be made until the Electric Railway Company filed at once application for leave to cross the C.P.R. Company's tracks at points designated.

5115. Application of the Canadian Retail Coal Association for a rate of 60 cents per ton on coal, carloads, from Buffalo, Black Rock or Suspension Bridge to York, Ont. (File No. 463·2.)

Order made that the tariffs of G.T.R. applicable on coal in carloads from Niagara frontier gateways and from Detroit be amended so as to apply to York, Ont., the rates shown therein as applying to Toronto. Amendments to take effect not later than Sept. 1, 1914. See Order No. 22220.

5116. Complaint of the village of Fergus, Ontario, against the increased charge for switching cars made by the Grand Trunk Railway Company of Canada to and from the Industrial spur of branch line in the village of Fergus, Ontario. (File No. 24300.)

Order made that the notice cancelling the exception of the interswitching service between the G.T.R. sidings at Fergus and the C.P.R. Co. from the operation of the general Interswitching Order of the Board No. 4988 be disallowed and that the toll of $3 per car be restored by July 20, 1914. See Order No. 22189.

5117. Complaint of William Pinkey, of Cooksville, Ont., relative to the lack of proper protection on his farm where it is crossed by the Canadian Pacific Railway Company and the Toronto Suburban Railway Company. (Adjourned hearing.) (File No. 23080.)

No order made. Railway Company undertaking to keep the crossing clear and offer to pay $100 towards the cost of maintaining the crossing, should the applicant decide to divert it.

5118. Application of Chas. A. Windatt, of the Township of Thorah, Ontario, under Sections 154 and 250, for an Order directing the C.P.R. Company (Georgian Bay & Seaboard Railway) to construct and maintain such drainage works upon their line of railway where same intersects his farm in Lot 4, Con. 10, Tp. of Thorah, as may be necessary to prevent the flooding of his lands and damages from such flooding and for an Order under Section 26a that he be relieved from the terms of a certain agreement entered into with the Railway with reference to a culvert or cattle pass by reason of the violation thereof by the Railway Company. (File No. 23676.)

No Order made. Railway Company undertaking to carry out the recommendation of the Board's Engineer except as to the increasing of the size of the pipe. The Company also to clean out the cattle pass as recommended by the Board's Engineer.

5119. Application of the Peterborough Machine & Lubricator Company, Limited, under Section 29, for an Order rescinding Order of the Board No. 15660, dated December 20, 1911, by which it was ordered that the C.P.R. Company be authorized to construct a branch line of railway for T. Kinnear & Company of the City of Peterborough, Ontario. (File No. 18797.)

Stands for two weeks to enable the railway company to decide whether it will take expropriation proceedings or not.

5120. Application of the Standard Crushed Stone Company, Limited, of Niagara Falls, Ontario, for an Order requiring the G.T.R. Company to immediately construct a side track to the plant of the said Standard Crushed Stone Company, Limited, near Windmill Point Station, on the line of the G.T.R. Company, Buffalo and Goderich branch, about two and one-half miles east of Ridgeway, Ontario. (File No. 23219.)

Order made granting the application subject to the terms and conditions set forth in the Order. See Order 22317.

5121. Complaint of J. E. Titchmarsh, of Hagersville, Ontario, relative to the lease granted by the G.T.R. Company to the Canada Seed Company of Hagersville, Ontario, for use of siding and elevator at that point. No order made.

5122. *Re* Trenton Business Spur. Petition of C. T. Clarkson, of Toronto, Ontario, for an Order directing the C. L. O. & W. Ry. Co. to immediately file plans and appoint arbitrators to determine questions arising between the petitioner and the Railway Company in connection with the expropriation of the lands held by the former as liquidator of Messrs. Lloyd & Sons, Limited, of Trenton, Ontario. (File No. 3701-347.)

Order made that the application to restrict the right of expropriation be dismissed and upon the consent of all parties that the arbitration pending to determine the compensation to be paid in respect of the taking of certain lands, be continued subject to the provisions set forth in the Order. See Order No. 23504.

5123. Application of the Hamilton & Toronto Sewer Pipe Company, Limited, under Section 226, for an Order directing the G.T.R. Company to provide and construct a suitable siding where the Company's Railway intersects lands of the Applicant Company in the Township of West Flamboro, Ontario. (File No. 22370.45.)

Order made rescinding Order No. 22392 and directing the G.T.R. Co. to construct a spur connecting with its main track and to erect an automatic block signal on the west bound main track. Spur to be completed by 1st Nov., 1914. See Order 22672.

5124. Application of the G.T.R. Company for an Order requiring the Hamilton & Toronto Sewer Pipe Company to replace the siding to the Hamilton & Toronto Sewer Pipe Company and the Fowler Canadian Company in the same condition as it was before they interfered with it. (File No. 7031. Case No. 3051.)

Order made dismissing the application. See Order 22327.

5125. Application of the Montreal & Southern Counties Railway Company (G. T.R.) under Section 227, for authority to cross at grade with its railway the line of the C.P.R. Company, from St. Hyacinthe to Farnham, on Lot 34, Parish of St. Paul de Abbottsford, P.Q. (File No. 12072-23.)

Order made granting the application subject to the conditions set forth in the Order. See Order No. 22229.

5126. Application of the G.T.R. Company, under section 227, for authority to cross at grade with its spur track serving the premises of the Elias Rogers Company, coal dealers, Toronto, Ontario, the tracks of the Toronto, Gray & Bruce Railway (C. P.R. at a point south of St. Clair Ave., City of Toronto, Ontario. (File No. 24277.)

Order made dismissing the application. See Order No. 22299.

5127. Application of W. J. Boland, of Toronto, on behalf of Hillar H. Findlay, of Toronto, Ontario, for an order compelling the G.T.R. Company to extend the railway siding of the G.T.R. Company constructed into the premises of the Fairbanks-Morse Canadian Company, Limited, Toronto, Ontario, into certain property recently rented for factory purposes. (File No. 14209.)

See judgment of the Chief Commissioner dated the 15th January, 1915, Appendix "C".

5128. Application of the Municipal Corporation of the Township of York, Ontario, under section 250, for an order directing the C.P.R. Company to provide and construct a drainage system suitable and sufficient for the drainage of Jane Street subway in the said Township of York where the line of the C.P.R. crosses the said street. (File No. 16288.)

No order necessary, board decided that the municipality is in no way responsible for the condition of the subway, and that the railway company having created the difficulty must look after the matter.

5129. Application of the Corporation of the City of Toronto, Ontario, under sections 237 and 238, for a hearing on the question of maintenance of the superstructure of the subway under the tracks of the C.P.R. Company at Keele Street, or for an order for the reconstruction of said superstructure to protect the public passing through the said subway. (File No. 21566.)

See judgment of the Chief Commissioner dated the 12th November, 1914, Appendix "C". Order made authorizing the City of Toronto at its own expense to make the superstructure of the subway carrying Keel Street under the tracks of the C.P.R. Co., waterproof. See Order 23036.

5130. Application of the C.N.O. Ry. Company, under section 237, for authority to construct its line of railway across Albany Road in the City of Toronto, Ontario, by means of a structure carrying the railway over the highway. (File No. 12021.5.)

Order made granting the application. See Order No. 22202.

5131. Application of the C.N.O. Railway Company, under section 237, for authority to construct its line of railway across Dufferin Street in the City of Toronto, Ontario, by means of a structure carrying the railway over the highway. (File No. 12021.91.)

Board approved of the width of the structure, the question of elevation of the railway over the highway reserved. Board's engineer to inspect and report thereon.

5132. Application of the C.N.O. Railway Company, under section 237, for authority to construct its line of railway across Bartlett Ave. in the City of Toronto, Ontario, by means of a structure carrying the railway over the highway. (File No. 12021-85.)

Board approved of the width of the structure, the question of elevation of the railway over the highway reserved. Board's engineer to inspect and report thereon.

5133. Application of the Canadian Northern Ontario Railway Company, under section 237, for authority to construct its line of railway across Geary Ave., in the

city of Toronto, Ontario, by means of a structure carrying the railway over the highway. (File No. 12021·89.)

Board approved of the width of the structure, the question of elevation of the railway over the highway reserved. Board's engineer to inspect and report thereon.

5134. Application of the C.P.R. Company for approval of the detail plan showing proposed subway at Davenport Road, Toronto, Ontario. (North Toronto Grade Separation.) (Substructure.) (File No. 22162.)

No order necessary.

5135. Application of the C.N.O. Railway Company, under section 237, for authority to construct its line of railway across Church and Dundas streets, in the Township of Etobicoke, County of York, Ontario. (File No. 12021·115.)

Matter referred to the Board's engineer to prepare sketch showing the suggested grade separation.

5136. Complaint of the Canadian Pacific Railway Company against the Hydro-Electric Power Commission of Ontario constructing power line across its line of railway at a point near Meneset Station, Ontario. (File No. 24548.)

Order made granting leave to the Hydro-Electric Power Commission of Ontario, to construct its wires across the tracks of the C.P.R. Co. See Order No. 22576.

5137. Application of the C.L.O. & W. Railway under section 237, for authority to construct its business spur track across certain streets in the town of Trenton, Ontario. (File No. 3701.373.)

Order made rescinding Order No. 22058 and authorizing the company to construct and operate its spur track across the streets set forth in the order, subject to the conditions contained in the order. See Order No. 22234.

5138. Application of the C.P.R. Company to construct a spur from the National Cash Register east of Shaw street, Toronto. (File No. 22333.16.)

No order necessary pending the carrying out of the arrangement made between the parties.

5139. Application of the C.N.O.R. under section 237, for authority to cross highway between lots 11 and 12, Junction gore, township of Gloucester, with the tracks of the transfer track connecting the C.N.O.R. and the G.T.R. Company's tracks, in accordance with plan dated June 23, 1914, drawing No. 8657. (File No. 3878.574.)

Application granted.

5140. *Re* overhead bridge for tracks of the Grand Trunk Railway Company and the Montreal Park and Island Railway Company at Rockfield, P.Q.

NOTE.—The board will consider the complaint that the Montreal Turnpike Trust has put its toll gate at an inconvenient place thereby practically blocking the road. (File No. 9437.119.)

Board decided to visit the locus on the 14th instant, if possible. Notice to be given to all parties. Mr. Surveyor to submit a statement in writing regarding his contention that the board is without jurisdiction so far as the Turnpike Trust Company is concerned.

5141. Application of the village of Weston, Ontario, for an order directing the Grand Trunk Railway Company to enlarge its subway at Weston Road, Weston, Ontario. (File No. 20188.)

No order made. Board decided that owing to the present financial situation it would not be warranted in making an order against the railway company.

5142. In the matter of the application of the St. John and Quebec Railway Company to the Board of Railway Commissioners for Canada and to the Board of Commissioners of Public Utilities for New Brunswick, for a joint order under sections 227-229 of the Railway Act directing the Canadian Pacific Railway Company as follows:—

1. To allow the St. John and Quebec Railway Company to connect its tracks with those of the Canadian Pacific Railway, in the city of Fredericton, province of New

Brunswick, and to maintain and operate the necessary switches and turnouts, at the following points:—

1. At a point between Westmorland and York streets marked "A" on plan.
2. At or near station 1159 plus 50 (C.P.R. location), marked "B" on plan.
3. At or near station 1118 plus 00 (C.P.R. location), marked "C" on plan.
4. At or near station 1072 plus 80 (C.P.R. location), marked "D" on plan.

2. To permit the St. John and Quebec Railway Company and its lessees to operate its trains, engines, cars, and other vehicles between A-B and between C-D above mentioned over and along the different tracks, switches, "Y" and sidings of the Canadian Pacific Railway Company or as leased by them.

3. To re-arrange spur track used by the Canadian Pacific Railway for switching between Westmorland and York streets (marked X on plan), so that said switching can be carried on south of the located line of the applicant company. (File No. 19077.1.)

Order made granting leave to the applicant company to cross with its tracks the tracks of the respondent company, as set out in the order, subject to the conditions therein set forth. See Order 22360.

5143. Application of the Canadian Northern Ontario Railway Company for authority to change the location of its station in the township of March, Ontario, from mileage 22, from Ottawa, to mileage 23·6 from Ottawa. (File No. 20309.)

Order made refusing the application. See Order No. 22399.

5144. In the matter of the joint express rates on fruit from points on the Canadian Northern to points on the Canadian and Dominion Express Companies lines, prescribed by Order of the Board No. 21877, dated May 26, 1914.

NOTE.—The companies will be required to state their objections to the proposed joint rates. (File No. 4214.391.)

No order necessary, express companies having published and filed a joint tariff as agreed with the Board's Traffic Officer.

5145. Application of the Corporation of the City of Toronto, Ontario, for a reconsideration of the plan of the subway at Spadina Road in order that such plan may be so amended as to leave Spadina Road and Bridgeman street at their full width. (File No. 22162.2.)

Railway Company to file new detail plan carrying out the suggestion of the Board's Assistant Chief Engineer made at the hearing.

5146. Application of the City of Montreal, P.Q., for an order declaring that the way of communication at Park avenue giving access between the territory of the City north and west of the line of the C. P. R. and the rest of the City of Montreal over the right of way of the company where located between Atlantic and Beaumont avenues, Laurier Ward, Montreal, has been used as a way of communication by the public for vehicular and pedestrian traffic and declaring that same is a public crossing over the right of way of the C. P. P. (File No. 12912.2.)

Order made authorizing the City of Montreal to open Park avenue across the tracks of the C.P.R. Company subject to protection set forth in the order. See Order No. 22896.

5147. *Re* North Toronto Grade Separation, C.P.R.

(Note.)—This matter is set down for the purpose of settling the terms of the order to be issued under the Assistant Chief Commissioner's judgment concurred in by Commissioners McLean and Goodeve. (File No. 9437.153.)

Order made dismissing the application. See Order No. 23508.

5148. Application of the Erie & Ontario Railway Company, under section 227, for leave to cross at grade in the township of Moulton, Ontario, the lines or tracks of the G. T. R. - (Air Line), jointly operated by the Grand Trunk and the Wabash Railroad Companies at mileage 9.80 of the Erie & Ontario railway. (File 24560.1.)

Order made granting the application. See Order No. 22524.

5149. Application of the Erie & Ontario Railway Company, under section 227, for leave to cross at grade in the township of Moulton, Ontario, with its railway lines or tracks, the lines or tracks of the Michigan Central Railway Company, (Canada Southern Division). (File No. 24560.2.)

Order made granting the application subject to the conditions set forth in the order. See Order No. 22431.

5150. Application of the Erie & Ontario Railway Company, under sections 221, 222, 223 and 237, for authority to construct spur line concession 2, township of Moulton, Ontario, running through the lands of A. B. Shupe and T. H. Jones, to a connection with the Michigan Central Railroad. (File No. 24560.6.)

Order for temporary connection to go as applied for.

5151. Application of the Erie & Ontario Railway Company, under section 227, for authority to cross at grade, in the town of Dunnville, Ontario, the tracks of the Grand Trunk Railway Company. (File 24560.26.)

Order made for grade crossing, subject to the recommendation of the Board's engineer.

5152. Application of the Municipal Corporation of the town of Parry Sound, Ontario, that the board reconsider Order No. 4008, dated 28th November, 1907, and for an order directing the Canadian Pacific Railway Company to construct a subway under its railway at Armstrong street, in the town of Parry Sound, Ontario. (File No. 23240.)

Order made dismissing the application.

5153. Application of the Erie & Ontario Railway Company, under sections 158, 159, 222 and 223, of the Railway Act, for an order authorizing proposed branch lines of railway to the freight and passenger stations of the company at Dunnville, Ontario, from station 0 to station 32 at or near the corner of Bridge and Canal streets and from station 0 to station 10 being the south leg of the "Y." (File No. 24560·5.)

Order having already issued no action necessary by the board.

5154. Application of the Grand Trunk Railway Company for authority to construct, maintain and operate two additional main line tracks at grade across the public highways between Guy street and St. Henri station in the city of Montreal, P.Q. (File No. 24834.)

Order made granting application.

5155. Application of the Grand Trunk Railway Company under sections 222 and 237 for authority to construct a siding from a point on its railway north of Isabella street in the City of Ottawa, Ontario, thence extending upon, along and across Isabella street and Metcalfe street to and into the premises of the Library Bureau of Canada, Limited, south of Isabella street. (File No. 22674.3.)

Parties to endeavour to reach an agreement upon the location with the Board's engineer. If not the board will make an order in the matter.

5156. Railway Companies subject to the jurisdiction of the Board are required to speak to the question of what constitutes proper filing of joint tariffs under Section 335 of the Railway Act. (File No. 24388.)

No Order necessary. Parties to confer with the Board's Chief Traffic Officer.

5157. Application of the Hamilton & Toronto Sewer Pipe Co., Ltd., of Hamilton, Ontario, for authority to construct a siding on the Grand Trunk Railway between Junction Cut and Dundas, Ontario. (File No. 22370·45.)

Order to issue for spur. G.T.R. Co. to submit plans.

5158. Application of the Township of Ancaster, Ontario, for an order for a subway under the tracks of the Hamilton and Dundas Street Railway and the T. H. & B. Ry., on Emerson street, West Hamilton, Township of Ancaster and also directing that the cost be apportioned between the railway companies and the Township of Ancaster. (File No. 9437·1011.)

Order made authorizing the Township of Ancaster to construct a grade crossing over the tracks of the T. H. & B. Ry. Co. on Emerson street in West Hamilton, Township of Ancaster. See Order No. 22608.

5159. Application of the Erie & Ontario Railway Company, for authority to make and carry its railway across and to use and occupy the right of way of the Toronto and Niagara Power Company in lot 32, concession 5, township of Gainsboro, Ontario. (File No. 24560-30.)

Order made declaring that the Niagara, St. Catharines & Toronto Ry. Co. is senior to the Erie & Ontario Ry. Co. for all tracks when constructed at the crossing in question. See Order No. 22732.

5160. Application of the city of Hamilton, Ontario, for protection of Grand Trunk Railway main line at Ottawa street, Hamilton, Ontario. (File No. 4552, Case 1223.)

Order made directing the G. T. R. Co. to install gates at the said crossing to be operated day and night by watchman on or before the 1st May, 1915. Twenty per cent of the cost of installing to be paid out of The Railway Grade Crossing Fund, and the balance by the railway company. See Order 22710.

5161. Application of the corporation of the city of Hamilton, Ont., for an order directing the T. H. & B. railway to construct a new highway bridge carrying the line of Locks street in the city of Hamilton, Ontario, over the tracks of the company at the intersection of Locks street and the T. H. & B. railway. (File No. 24498.)

No order made, the T. H. & B. Ry. undertaking to put in steel stringers over the track openings and repair the bridge.

5162. Application of the city of Hamilton, Ontario, for approval of plans showing proposed extension of Birmingham street across the northerly spur of the T. H. & B. Ry. (File No. 20395-1.)

Order made refusing the application. See Order No. 22602.

5163. Application of the corporation of the city of Hamilton, Ont., directing the T. H. & B. railway and the C. P. R. to construct a new highway bridge carrying the line of King street in the city of Hamilton over the tracks of the company at the intersection of King street and the Toronto Branch of the T. H. & B. railway. (File No. 24499.)

Referred to the board's engineer to report on.

5164. Application of the Grasselli Chemical Company of Hamilton, Ont., to fix the amount of the compensation to be paid under paragraph 2 of the order No. 21899, dated May 26, 1914. (File No. 20519.)

Board decided that no further order was necessary in connection with this matter.

5165. Application of the Erie & Ontario Railway Company for authority to close road being in lot 5, concession 2, township of Gainsborough, county of Lincoln, Ontario, and to obtain diversion of for said township. (File No. 24560-23.)

Order made authorizing the applicant company to divert the highway. See Order No. 22695.

5166. Complaint of B. F. Justin, K.C., of Brampton, Ontario, relative to width of cattle pass on the property of A. G. Waite, Streetsville, Ont., on the line of the C.P.R. (File No. 3294-17.)

Order made directing the C.P.R. Co. to construct a cattle pass as set forth in the order. Work to be completed by the 1st December, 1915. See order No. 22647.

5167. Consideration of the matter of protection at the crossing of the G.T.R., on the 25th side road of the Township of Albion, being the first crossing south of Palgrave Station, Ont. (File No. 9437-1152.)

No order necessary, the railway company undertaking to move the crossing planks northward about 20 feet so as to provide a better view of trains approaching from the south. The municipality to remove certain shrubbery.

5168. Application of Messrs. Mills, Raney, Lucas & Hales, of Toronto, Ontario, on behalf of W. J. Lawrence, of Richmond Hill, Ont., for a hearing of the board in connection with the matter of siding agreement with the C.N.O.R. at Richmond Hill, Ontario. (File No. 19664.)

No order made, the railway company undertaking to install a stop block by the 22nd October, 1914, and it being agreed that the siding will not be taken up by the railway company except after leave granted.

5169. Consideration of the report of Inspector T. Harris relative to accident at public crossing just east of Seaforth Station, Ont., where Dr. Scott was injured May 16, 1914, on the line of the G.T.R. (File No. 9437.1167.)

Order made directing the G.T.R. Company to employ a watchman at the said crossing between 7 a.m. and 7 p.m. Wages to be paid 20 per cent by the town of Seaforth and the balance by the railway company. See order 22659.

5170. Application of the municipal council of the village of Coldwater, Ont., for an order directing the G.T.R. and C.P.R. Companies to provide interswitching facilities at Coldwater, Ont. (File No. 6713.62.)

Order made directing the C.P.R. Company by the 25th December, 1914, to construct a transfer track between its railway and the Grand Trunk Railway at Coldwater, Ont. See Order No. 22915.

5171. Application of the municipal council of the village of Richelieu, P.Q., for an order directing the Central Vermont Railway Company to widen and extend roadway crossed by their tracks at a point about fifty feet east of the east end of the Richelieu river bridge, in the village of Richelieu, P.Q. (File No. 24381.)

No order made. Board's engineer to report in the matter.

5172. Complaint of the municipal council of the village of L'Annonciation, P.Q., relative to dangerous crossing on the line of the Canadian Pacific Railway Company near Rivière Rouge bridge. (File No. 9437.879.)

No order necessary, the board's inspector to test the bell already installed and report in the matter.

5173. Application of the municipal corporation of the town of Victoriaville, P.Q., for authority to discontinue Albert street across the line and tracks of the Grand Trunk Railway Company, in the town of Victoriaville, P.Q. (File No. 24392.)

Order made refusing the application. See Order No. 22764.

5174. Application of the town of Pointe-aux-Trembles, P.Q., for an order authorizing the opening up of Sixth avenue across the tracks of the Canadian Northern Quebec Railway Company and the Montreal Tramways Company within the limits of the said town. (File 20569.)

Order made refusing application. See Order 22742.

5175. Application of the town of Pointe-aux-Trembles, P.Q., for an order authorizing the opening up of Fifth avenue across the tracks of the Canadian Northern Quebec Railway Company and the Montreal Tramways Company within the limits of the said town. (File No. 24048.)

Order made refusing application. See Order No. 22742.

5176. Application of the Grand Trunk Railway Company, under section 237, for authority to construct an additional track across 18th avenue in the city of Lachine, P.Q. (File No. 9437.121.)

Order made granting application. See Order No. 22625.

5177. Application of the city of Montreal, P.Q., for an order declaring that the way of communication at Park avenue giving access between the territory of the city north and west of the line of the C.P.R., and the rest of the city of Montreal over the right of way of the company where located between Atlantic and Beaumont avenues, Laurier ward, Montreal, has been used as a way of communication by the public for vehicular and pedestrian traffic and declaring that same is a public crossing over the right of way of the C.P.R.. (File No. 12912.2.)

Order made authorizing the applicant to open Park avenue in the city of Montreal across the tracks of the C.P.R. Co., subject to the conditions set forth in the order. See Order No. 22896.

5178. Application of the city of Montreal, P.Q., to regularize the present crossing of Baldwin street, Longue Pointe ward, over the right of way of the Canadian Northern Quebec Railway Company, and to extend and construct said Baldwin street over the said right of way. (File No. 24696.)

Order made refusing the applications to open up Mercier avenue, Lebrun, Azilda, DeRocheblave and Contrecoeur streets. Applicants authorized to open Baldwin, Des Ormeaux and Hector streets in the city of Montreal, across the tracks of the Canadian Northern Quebec Railway. See Order No. 22751.

5179. Application of the city of Montreal, P.Q., to regularize the present crossing of Mercier street, Longue Pointe ward, Montreal, P.Q., over the right of way of the Canadian Northern Quebec Railway Company and to construct and extend said street over the said right of way. (File No. 24697.)

Order made refusing the applications to open up Mercier Ave., Lebrun, Azilda, DeRocheblave and Contrecoeur streets. Applicants authorized to open Baldwin, Des Ormeaux and Hector streets in the city of Montreal, across the tracks of the C.N.Q.R. See Order 22751.

5180. Application of the City of Montreal, P.Q., to regularize the present crossing of Lebrun Street, Longue Pointe Ward, Montreal, P.Q., over the right of way of the Canadian Northern Quebec Railway Company and to construct and extend said street over the said right of way. (File No. 24698.)

Order made refusing the applications to open up Mercier Ave., Lebrun, Azilda, DeRocheblave and Contrecoeur streets. Applicants authorized to open Baldwin, Des Ormeaux and Hector streets in the city of Montreal, across the tracks of the C.N.Q.R. See Order 22751.

5181. Application of the City of Montreal, P.Q., to regularize the present crossing of Azilda street, Longue Pointe Ward, Montreal, P.Q., over the right of way of the Canadian Northern Quebec Railway Company and to construct and extend said street over the said right of way. (File No. 24699.)

Judgment reserved.

Order made refusing the applications to open up Mercier Ave., Lebrun, Azilda, DeRocheblave and Contrecoeur streets. Applicants authorized to open Baldwin, Des Ormeaux and Hector streets in the city of Montreal, across the tracks of the C.N.Q.R. See Order 22751.

5182. Application of the City of Montreal, P.Q., to regularize the present crossing of Des Ormeaux street, Longue Pointe Ward, Montreal, P.Q., over the right of way of the Canadian Northern Quebec Railway Company and to construct and extend said street over the said right of way. (File No. 24700.)

Order made refusing the applications to open up Mercier Ave., Lebrun, Azilda, DeRocheblave and Contrecoeur streets. Applicants authorized to open Baldwin, Des Ormeaux and Hector streets in the city of Montreal, across the tracks of the C.N.Q.R. See Order 22751.

5183. Application of the City of Montreal, P.Q., to regularize the present crossing of De Rocheblave street, Longue Pointe Ward, Montreal, Que., over the right of way of the Canadian Northern Quebec Railway Company and to construct and extend the said street over the said right of way. (File No. 24701.)

Order made refusing the applications to open up Mercier Ave., Lebrun, Azilda, DeRocheblave and Contrecoeur streets. Applicants authorized to open Baldwin, Des Ormeaux and Hector streets in the city of Montreal, across the tracks of the C.N.Q.R. See Order 22751.

5184. Application of the City of Montreal, P.Q., to regularize the present crossing of Contrecoeur street, Longue Pointe Ward, Montreal, P.Q., over the right of way of the Canadian Northern Quebec Railway Company and to construct and extend the said street over the said right of way. (File No. 24702.)

Order made refusing the applications to open up Mercier Ave., Lebrun, Azilda, DeRocheblave and Contrecoeur streets. Applicants authorized to open Baldwin, Des Ormeaux and Hector streets in the city of Montreal, across the tracks of the C.N.Q.R. See Order 22751.

5185. Application of the City of Montreal P.Q., to regularize the present crossing of Hector street, Longue Pointe Ward, Montreal, P.Q., over the right of way of the Canadian Northern Quebec Railway Company and to construct and extend the said street over the said right of way. (File No. 24703.)

Order made refusing the applications to open up Mercier Ave., Lebrun, Azilda, De Rocheblave and Contrecoeur streets. Applicants authorized to open Baldwin, Des Ormeaux and Hector streets in the City of Montreal across the tracks of the C.N.Q.R. See Order No. 22751.

5186. Application of the Corporation of the City of Montreal, P.Q., for an order authorizing it to extend Sherbrooke street, in Hochelaga Ward, of the City of Montreal, across the right of way of the Canadian Pacific Railway Company by means of a bridge. (File No. 24488.)

Referred to the Board's engineer to report on.

5187. Application of the United Fruit Companies of Nova Scotia for an order requiring the Dominion Atlantic Railway Company to furnish bills of lading and to route shipments of apples via Intercolonial Railway to Montreal and points beyond. (File No. 24721.)

The Board decided that no order was necessary in this matter.

5188. Complaint of the Montreal Board of Trade, Toronto Board of Trade, Hamilton Board of Trade, and Ontario Wholesale Grocers's Guild against the cancellation of mixing privileges in connection with carloads of groceries, dried fruit and liquors from Eastern Canada points to points in Western Canada. (File No. 18755.21.)

Order made that the proposed cancellation of the said arrangement be suspended until further order of the Board. See General Order No. 133.

5189. Application of the Lake Erie & Northern Railway Company under sections 158 and 159, for approval of plan, profile, and book of reference showing part of company's main line in the Town of Galt, Ont., from Station 1135:50 to Station 1167: 30·7; (2) for an order under section 176 allowing them right of way over the tracks of the C.P.R. between station 1160:78·5 to the connection with the C.P.R. at Station 2921: ·40 and to connect with the tracks of the L. E. & N. Ry. at said last mentioned point in the Town of Galt, Ont. (3) for an order under section 176 allowing them to use tracks of the right of way of the C.P.R. between Stations 1114: 76·3 and 1135:50 in the Town of Galt, Ont. (File No. 18034·72.)

Order made granting the application subject to conditions set forth in the order. See Order 22689.

5190. Application of the Lake Erie & Northern Railway Company, under sections 158 and 159, for approval of the revised location of its line of railway from Bruce Street in the Town of Galt, Ont., to connection with the C.P.R. on the north side of Main Street, in said Town of Galt, Ontario.

And complaint of the Corporation of the Town of Galt, Ont., against the proposed diversion of Mill creek in said town as shown on plan of the L. E. & N. Ry. of its revised location through the property of the R. McDougall Company in said town of Galt, Ont. (File No. 18034·70.)

Order made granting the application subject to conditions set forth in the order. See Order 22665.

5191. Application of the St. David's Sand Company, Limited, for a joint rate on sand from the company's spur on the Michigan Central Railroad near Niagara Falls, Ont., to the Welland Ship Canal Works via Niagara Falls and the Grand Trunk Railway. (File No. 24931.)

Order made that the M.C.R. and G.T.R. companies publish and file a joint rate of 50 cents per ton of 2,000 lbs. on sand from applicant company's pit to Merritton. Said rate to be made not later than Nov. 9th, 1914. See Order 22745.

5192. Application of the Standard Crushed Stone Company, Ltd., of Niagara Falls, Ont., for an order requiring the Grand Trunk Railway to publish and place in effect, on or before October 10th, 1914, rates on cobble, crushed, field and rubble stone from the Stone Company's Siding near Windmill Point Station, Ont., to points on the Grand Trunk Railway and to points on the Michigan Central Railway road via the Grand Trunk Railway and Michigan Central Railroad. (File No. 22310-1.)

Order made granting the application.

5193. Application of John Morrison for a crossing across the Canadian Northern Ontario Railway Company's right of way on part of lot 14, con. 1, Township of Pembroke, now within the town of Pembroke, Ont. (File No. 3561-202.)

No change made in the crossing, but the applicant may move it at his own expense.

5194. Application of the Grand Trunk Railway Company for a re-hearing of the matter of the application of the G.T.R., under section 227, for authority to cross at grade with its spur track serving the premises of the Elias Rogers Company, coal dealers, Toronto, Ont., the tracks of the Toronto, Grey & Bruce Railway (C.P.R.) at a point south of St. Clair Ave., Toronto, Ont., which application was dismissed by order of the Board No. 22299, dated July 30th, 1914. (File No. 24277.)

Order made granting the application; the crossing to be protected by an interlocking plant. See Order No 23033.

5195. Application of the Sudbury-Copper Cliff Suburban Electric Railway Company for an order granting the company authority to construct its line, and tracks across the lines and tracks of the C.P.R. (main line and spurs in the town of Sudbury, Ont.) in the town of Sudbury, Ont. (File No. 24842.)

Order made authorizing the Copper Cliff Suburban Electric Ry. Co. to cross the tracks of the C.P.R. at Elm street in town of Sudbury, subject to the conditions set forth in the order. See Order 22826.

5196. Application of the Canadian Pacific Railway Company for an order directing the Grand Trunk Railway Company to restore opening in fences on the northerly side of the C.P.R. Company's west bound track and refrain from interfering with the proper access to the company's station at Parkdale, Ont. (File No. 24710.)

No order necessary. The Grand Trunk Railway Company undertakes to restore the opening in the fence forthwith.

5197. Application of the town of Listowel, Ontario, for an order directing the Grand Trunk and Canadian Pacific Railway Companies to establish interswitching facilities between their lines of railway at Listowel, Ontario. (File No. 8453, Case 3927.)

Order made directing the installation of a transfer track for the interchange of traffic between the G.T. and C.P.R .Co's. at Listowel; the work to be done by the C.P.R. and the track to be constructed within one month after the erection of Libby McNeil and Libby Company's factory. See Order 22819.

5198. Application of the Canadian Pacific Railway Company, under section 228, for authority to connect its railway with the Oshawa Railway, near the town of Oshawa, Ontario. (Adjourned hearing.) (File No. 6713.84.)

Order made authorizing the C. P. R. Co. to connect its lines and tracks with the tracks of the Oshawa Electric Railway Company near Oshawa. See Order 22753.

5199. Application of the municipal council of the town of Trenton, Ont., for an order compelling the Canadian Northern Ontario Railway Company to remedy the

obstruction caused by their track on Ontario street, Trenton, Ont. (File No. 3878.580.)

Stands for consultation between the parties. The town to file a plan showing how Ontario street became a street in fact.

5200. Complaint of the village of Ste. Anne de Bellevue, P.Q., *re* drainage of subway of the C.P.R. and G.T.R. under their double main line tracks at Ste. Anne de Bellevue. (File No. 9437·1044.)

No permanent arrangement made; Grand Trunk Railway to put in temporary tile to take care of the water. This can be removed next spring or later if necessary.

5201. Application of the Canadian Northern Ontario Railway Company, under sections 29 and 227, for approval of proposed connection with the Canadian Pacific Railway near Chaudière Junction, and for a rescission of that portion of Order No. 7490, dated July 6, 1909, in so far as it refers to a connection with the tracks of the Ottawa and Prescott Railway Company at mile 56·6 west from Hawkesbury. (File No. 10823.)

Stands. Application to be renewed after the question of general interswitching is dealt with.

5202. Lighting of main line switches and the displaying of night signals from sunset to sunrise. C.P.R. will be required to show cause why an order should not go regulating this matter. (File No. 18767.)

Stands for further information to be filed by Mr. Lawrence for the B.L.E.

5203. Application of the town of Trenton, Ont., for an order directing the Canadian Northern Ontario Railway, Central Ontario Railway, Canadian Pacific Railway, and Grand Trunk Railway Companies to install interswitching facilities in the town of Trenton, Ont. (File No. 6713.87.)

Referred to Board's traffic department for report.

5204. Complaint of the town of Kenora, Ont., that the bridge over waterway in the said town of Kenora, controlled by the Rat Portage Lumber Company and the Canadian Pacific Railway Company, is interfering with navigation, and request that the Board adjust the matter. (File No. 24514.)

No order made. If the town of Kenora desire, however, to raise the bridge at its own expense it may apply to the Board to have the construction removed at the expense of the town.

5205. Application of the municipality of West Kildonan, Man., for a crossing over the tracks of the Selkirk branch of the Canadian Pacific Railway Company at Enniskillen avenue, D.G.S. 6, Kildonan, Man. (File No. 24875.)

Order made granting the application to cross the tracks of the C.P.R. Company's line at Enniskillen avenue, in the municipality of West Kildonan, Man., but refusing application to construct highway over the C.P.R. tracks at Kenilworth avenue. See Order 23141.

5206. Application of the municipality of West Kildonan, Man., for a crossing over the tracks of the Canadian Pacific Railway Company at Park Manor Boulevard, D.G.S. 29, Kildonan, Man. (File No. 24877.)

Application withdrawn.

5207. Application of the town of Tuxedo, Man., for an order directing the Canadian Northern Railway Company and the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway Company to construct and maintain a suitable street crossing over their tracks where the same are crossed by or cross Kennaston Boulevard, in the city of Winnipeg, and in the town of Tuxedo or the continuation of the same southerly, or authorizing the said town to construct such crossing and apportion the cost thereof between the said town, the city of Winnipeg, and the railway companies. (Adjourned hearing.) (File No. 23675.)

Order made granting the application. Applicant to bear the cost of the work.

5208. Complaint of the Northwest Grain Dealers' Association against the refusal of the railways to accept Flax Seed in bulk except at owner's risk of leakage.

Notice published in C.P.R. Sup. 3 to C.R.C. W. 1962, C.N.R. Sup. 1 to C.R.C. W. 803, G.T.P. Sup 1 to C.R.C. 30. Effective Oct. 21, 1914. (File No. 25037.)

Order made granting the application and directing that flax seed will be accepted for shipment in bulk only at the owner's risk of leakage in accordance with the Canadian Freight Classification, excepting that if the shippers make written request for cars suitably lined at their expense such cars shall be furnished with the least possible delay, in which case the company will assume the risk of leakage. See Order No. 23894.

5209. Application of the city of Winnipeg, Man., for leave to construct a crossing over the tracks of the Canadian Pacific Railway Company at Midwinter avenue, Winnipeg, Manitoba. (File No. 24943.)

Order made granting the application.

5210. Application of the Canadian Pacific Railway Company, under sections 222 and 237, for authority to construct an alteration to existing spur for the city of Winnipeg on Rachel Street East, in lot 49, Block 'B,' city of Winnipeg, Manitoba, on the Applicant Company's main line, Manitoba division. (File No. 14920.)

Order made granting the application.

5211. Application of the Canadian Pacific Railway Company, under Section 151, for authority to lower the grade of the portion of Maple street, Winnipeg, Manitoba, lying northward of the production westerly of said Maple street of a line drawn parallel to and 26 feet north of the north limit of lot 57, plan 63, subdivision of lot 35, east St. John, and south of Point Douglas avenue, not at present covered by the tracks and buildings of the said Canadian Pacific Railway Company. (File No. 25147.)

Order made granting the application.

5212. *Re* Winnipeg Electric Railway crossing Canadian Pacific Railway at Selkirk and Logan avenues, Winnipeg, Manitoba.

NOTE.—The Board will consider letter of the Winnipeg Electric Railway Company as to the status of watchmen employed and the responsibility of the Electric Railway on the one hand and the Canadian Pacific Railway Company on the other for their negligence. (File No. 8922 and case 4716.)

See judgment of Assistant Chief Commissioner Scott, dated December 31, 1914, Appendix "C."

5213. *Re* subway under the tracks of the Canadian Pacific Railway Company at Salter street, Winnipeg, Manitoba.

NOTE.—The Board will consider detail plans of the structure as submitted by the city of Winnipeg in accordance with Order No. 22124, dated July 2, 1914. (File No. 3084.)

Order made granting the application, the cost of the proposed subway to be borne and paid by the corporation of the city of Winnipeg. See Order 22124.

5214. Application of the Suburban Rapid Transit Company of Winnipeg for an Order properly apportioning cost of protection at St. James crossing by the Canadian Northern, Suburban Rapid Transit Company and the Winnipeg Electric Railway Company. (File No. 24978.)

Order made directing the crossing of the C.N.R. by the Suburban Rapid Transit Co. on Portage ave., in the city of Winnipeg be protected by a half inter-locking plant with derails, subject to conditions set forth in order. See Order No. 23084.

5215. Complaint of the Page-Hersey Iron Tube & Lead Co., against the increase of 5 per cent in the rate on skelp, carloads, from the Pittsburg district to Welland, Ont., published to take effect November 16. (File No. 23359.)

Judgment reserved.

5216. Complaint of the Riordan Pulp & Paper Company, against the increased rates on woodpulp and sulphite from Merritton and Thorold to United States points, made effective November 16th instant, by supplement No. 6 to Canadian Northern Railway Company's Joint Through Freight Tariff No. C.R.C. E 251. (File No. 25165.)

Referred to the Board's Traffic Officer for report.

5217. Application of the town of Lasalle, P.Q., for an Order requiring the New York Central and Hudson River R. R. Co., and the Canadian Pacific Railway Company to provide an improved train service between Montreal and Highlands and Adirondack Junction. (File No. 19855.23 and File No. 23910.)

Order made granting the application.

5218. Application of the American Coal & Coke Company, of Detroit, Mich., for an order disallowing note 3 to rule 1, page 7, of the Michigan Central R.R. Company's Tariff C.R.C. No. 2171, which reserves the right to the Company to hold cars for consignees located within the Detroit switching limits at Windsor, awaiting final delivery orders, or when delivery cannot be effected due to inability of consignees to receive same.

Also for an order requiring the said R.R. Co. to refund with interest, the sum paid under protest by the applicants under the same tariff rule. (File No. 24713.)

Refused. See judgment Chief Commissioner, Appendix "C."

5219. Railway Companies to speak to the following general proposition, viz.:—

That a passenger toll between any two given points having been reduced because of competition, and having been voluntarily made the maximum between intermediate points where competition does not exist, should also be made the maximum to or from equivalent mileage points on branch lines connecting at one or more of the said intermediate points. (File No. 22416.)

See Judgment of Commissioner S. J. McLean, dated January 7, 1915. Appendix "C.".

5220. Application of the Fruit Growers' Association of Ontario, *re* shipment of apples. (File No. 19666.)

Judgment reserved.

5221. Application of the City of Prince Albert, Saskatchewan, for an order directing the Canadian Northern Railway Company to place a flagman at the railway crossing on Fourth avenue, west Prince Albert, Saskatchewan. (File No. 9437.1142.)

Order made that the order providing for appointment of watchman at Central avenue, Prince Albert, be amended, and that all passenger trains be flagged across Central avenue at the expense of the railway company.

5222. Application of the municipal council of the town of Beverley, Alta., for an order directing the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway to provide a passenger station in the vicinity of Beverley, Alberta. (Adjourned hearing.) (File No. 23890.)

No action taken. The matter may be brought up again upon the request of the municipality.

5223. Application of the Jasper Park Collieries, Limited, for a transfer track between the Canadian Northern Railway main line and the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway Company's siding at Geikie, Alberta. (File No. 6713.82.)

No order made. Applicant company may renew the application when the C. N. R. resumes operation.

5224. Complaint of R. P. Cull, Fallis, Alta., against the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway Company using his land on the shore of Wabamun lake as right of way, also that the road crossing on the road allowance is not passable for teams. Adjourned hearing. (File No. 2236, Case No. 3851.)

No order made, the railway company undertaking to send an engineer at once to make the necessary measurements and to indicate on the ground what land is to be taken. Board's engineer to inspect the crossing and report on it.

5225. The Edmonton, Dunvegan & British Columbia Railway Company will be required to show cause why it should not comply with the requirements of general order of the Board No. 107, relative to fire protection. (File Nos. 4741-F-45 and 4741-A-45.)

Judgment reserved.

5226. Complaint of R. H. Campbell, Director of Forestry, Department of Interior, that the G. T. P. have not complied with the requirements of Regulation 13 of General Order No. 107 relative to extinguishing fires occurring within 300 feet of the track, in that they failed to extinguish a fire at mile 34 on their Alberta coal branch. (File No. 4741-F-18.2.)

No order made, Board decided it had no jurisdiction.

5227. Application of H. H. Cooper & Company, under section 226, for an order directing the Canadian Northern Railway Company to construct a spur from the railway to lots 231 and 232 in block 1 of the Hudson Bay Company's Reserve in Edmonton, Alberta. (File No. 22372.19.)

Order made under section 222 of the Railway Act, Railway Company to file formal application and plan and spur to be constructed forthwith with a 30 degree curve and running as close to the building as possible.

5228. Application of the resident property owners of Prince George and South Fort George for a change in the location of the station of the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway at Prince George, B.C. (File No. 21418.)

Order made fixing the location of station.

5229. Application of the Canadian Pacific Railway Company for approval of plan showing the Christie street subway, North Toronto Grade Separation, Toronto.

(Note.)—Board will hear application of Clark & Clark, Limited, for an order directing the immediate completion of work opposite their property. (File No. 12021.126.)

Board decided that the work is to be gone on with forthwith.

5230. Application of the City of Montreal, P.Q., for an interim ex parte order on the application for temporary extension of Girouard avenue, Notre Dame de Graces ward, over the right of way of the Canadian Pacific Railway Company. (File No. 25156.)

City of Montreal to make formal application for crossing when matter will be dealt with by the Board.

5231. Application of the city of Montreal, P.Q., for an interim ex parte order on the application for temporary extension of Regent avenue, Notre Dame de Graces ward, over the right of way of the Canadian Pacific Railway Company. (File No. 25158.)

City of Montreal to make formal application for crossing when matter will be dealt with by the Board.

5232. Complaint of the Milton Pressed Brick Company, Ltd., against the proposed increase in the minimum weight on brick, carloads, published to take effect December 1, 1914. (File No. 19475.13.)

Order made with respect to the tariffs of the Railway Companies subject to the jurisdiction of the Board and operating in Eastern Canada, as set forth in the order. Effect to be given to the order not later than December 31, 1914. See order 22963.

5233. Resumption of the inquiry into the tolls and practices with respect to switching and interswitching, with particular reference to the evidence and statistics presented by the carriers relating to the costs of the service. (Adjourned hearing.) (File No. 6713, Case 2846.)

Order made amending new minimum weight 50,000 pounds for building bricks and disallowing the additional 5 per cent per foot for long cars in connection with all building material.

5234. Application of the city of Fernie, B.C., for an order directing the Crow's Nest Southern Railway (G.N.R.) to construct a subway at the intersection of its railway with Cox street in the city of Fernie, B.C. (File No. 9437.1111.)

Order made for pedestrian subway at Cox street, with a headroom of 7 feet 6 inches by 8 feet in width in accordance with plan filed by the railway company, cost

to be divided equally between the railway company and the city of Fernie, accounts to be submitted by the company to the city. When dispute arises the same to be submitted to the Board for adjustment.

5235. Consideration of the matter of protection at Twelfth street east crossing, Calgary, Alta., on the line of the Canadian Pacific Railway Company. (File No. 9437.1186.)

Board directed that a watchman be put on the crossing by the railway company, to be on duty from 8 a.m., to 7 p.m., his expenses to be paid by the city of Calgary. Order made removing the slow order upon the watchman being appointed. City of Calgary to have the right to submit any further scheme of protection at any farther time it so desires in regard to this crossing.

5236. Application for the removal of the speed limitation from the crossing at Eighth street east, Calgary, Alta., where accident occurred on July 16, 1914. (File No. 9437.1177.)

Order made granting the application.

5237. Application of the city of Calgary, Alta., for an order directing the Canadian Pacific and Grand Trunk Railway Companies to establish transfer tracks in the city of Calgary, Alta. (File No. 10821.95.)

See judgment of Asst. Chief Commissioner Scott, dated January 7, 1915. Appendix "C".

5238. Complaint, Board of Trade of Ensign, Alta., with regard to the C.P.R. closing its station at Ensign. (File No. 25119.)

Application refused. Order made requiring the C.P.R. Co. to have the station heated before the arrival and departure of passenger trains during cold weather.

5239. Complaint of C. W. Ozias *et al re* proposed closing of C.P.R. station at Mazeppa, Alta. (File No. 20645.)

Order made refusing the application of the company to remove station agent at Mazeppa.

Application withdrawn.

5240. Application C.N.R. regarding the closing of certain streets in the city of Calgary, in section 26.23-1, W. 5 M.

Application withdrawn.

5241. Application of the city of Calgary for an order settling the time by which the diversion of Lindsay avenue shall be completed by the Canadian Northern Railway Co.

Order made granting the application, work to be completed by March 1, 1915.

5242. Application of the city of Calgary for an order compelling the C.N.R. Co., to carry out the terms of its agreement with the city under which the city consented to the plan showing the route of entrance of the said company's railway into the city of Calgary, referred to in Orders 14611, 14616 and 17470. (File No. 25264.)

Order made dismissing the application but directing that the C.N.R. Co. provide a 5 per cent grade at the approaches to the crossings of Thistle, Pine and Hungerford streets and Spruce and Poplar avenues, city of Calgary. See Order No. 23179.

5243 and 5244. Application by the city of Calgary for an order compelling the Calgary Water Power Company, Ltd., to carry out order of the Board No. 22225. (File No. 1750-79.)

See judgment of Assistant Chief Commissioner Scott, dated November 26, 1914. Appendix "C."

5245. Application of the town of Courtenay, B.C., for an order directing the Esquimalt and Nanaimo Railway Company to permit the Provincial Government to make a road from the company's freight shed in a northwesterly direction to the Lake Trail, a distance approximately of 900 feet, so as to obviate the haul now necessary from the Lake Trail Road to the freight shed of approximately 5,700 feet. (File No. 22804.)

Order made dismissing the application. See Order No. 23001.

5246. Application of the Board of Trade of Cumberland, B.C., for an order directing that an interchange track be provided between the lines of the Canadian Collieries, Ltd., and the Esquimalt and Nanaimo Railway Company, at a point at or near the crossing of the line of the E. & N. Ry. Co. and the Canadian Collieries, Ltd. (File No. 25120.)

Order made directing the E. & N. Ry. Co. to construct a transfer track between its railway and the railway of the Canadian Collieries, Ltd., at Royston, upon the conditions set forth in the order. Plans to be filed by the 1st March, 1915. See Order 23187.

5247. Application of the Empress Manufacturing Company, Ltd., for an order requiring the Canadian Pacific Railway to extend siding at Mission City, some one hundred and twenty-five feet more or less, to reach the factory of the Mission Manufacturing Company, and also a branch factory of the Empress Manufacturing Company. (File No. 25162.)

Application struck off the list.

5248. Application of the Pacific Land and Townsites Company, Ltd., John Stinson and J. H. McGregor, for an order under section 159, directing the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway Company to acquire their right of way through lots 782 and 788, Cariboo District, B.C. (File No. 3452·19.)

Judgment reserved. Railway Company to make its submissions in writing.

5249. Application of the Pacific Land and Townsites Company, Ltd., Vancouver, B.C., for an order directing the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway Company to construct and maintain a depot between Willow avenue and Pine street, on the G.T.P. Railway in D.L. 788, Willow River, B.C., also to construct and maintain adequate side tracks to conserve future interests of Willow River upon D.L. 788, and to stop between Pine street and Willow avenue, on D.L. 788 all passenger trains and way freight trains. (File No. 19272.)

Judgment reserved. Railway company to make its submissions in writing.

5250. Application of the Vancouver, Victoria and Eastern Railway and Navigation Company for authority to expropriate certain lands in the New Westminster district, part of the lands being required for the purpose of diverting the Gunn Road and Brunette Road and part for the purpose of providing an overhead crossing over the tracks of the said railway company at the North Road; also for an order closing portions of the Gunn Road and Brunette Road; and in the matter of Order No. 19928, dated July 30, 1913, directing the applicant company to construct a steel bridge over its tracks on the line of the North Road, etc.

The board will consider representations of interested municipalities respecting the protection to be provided at North Road, also as to necessity for a permanent retaining wall at this point. (File No. 572·33.)

Order made rescinding Order No. 19928, dated July 30, 1913, and directing that a close board fence be erected and maintained along the whole length of the piling between the retaining wall and the highway at the point in question; work to be completed by the 15th of February, 1915. See Order No. 23174.

5251. Application of the city of Vancouver, B.C., for an order directing the construction of highways on Hastings, Pender, Keefer and Harris streets, by way of overhead bridges or viaducts, over the railway of the Vancouver, Victoria and Eastern Railway and Navigation Company at its intersection of said streets.

(Note.) The parties will speak to the question as to whether the construction of the viaducts on Hastings, Pender, Keefer and Harris streets will be proceeded with or not. (File No. 20062.)

Order made rescinding Order 17840 and directing the railway company to erect crossing signs at said crossings. See Order No. 23074.

5252. Application of the Department of Public Works for authority to construct level crossing over the G.N.R. at a point just east of White Rock Station, B.C. and

Application of the municipality of Surrey for a grade crossing over the line of the Great Northern Railway opposite Martin street, White Rock. (File No. 25046.)

Order made granting the application. See Order No. 23035.

5253. Application of the municipal council of New Westminster *re* dangerous crossing of the Great Northern Railway Company over Front street near the intersection of Columbia street opposite the penitentiary, New Westminster. (File No. 9437-1221.)

Order made directing the G.N.R. Co., to install an approved type of automatic bell at the said crossing and to maintain the same at its own expense, 20 per cent of the cost of installing the bell to be paid out of The Railway Grade Crossing Fund. See Order No. 23047.

5254. Application of the Stoltze Manufacturing Company of Ruskin, B.C., for a joint tariff reducing the switching charge on cars of shingles from their mill on the Western Canada Power Company's railroad to the junction with the Canadian Pacific Railway at Ruskin, B.C. (File No. 25025.)

Order made that the Canadian Pacific and Western Canada Power Co., jointly publish and file supplements to the C.P.R. Co.'s special joint tariffs as set out in the order. Order No. 23213 rescinded. See Order 23332.

5255. Complaint of the Oliver-Scrim Lumber Company of Vancouver, B.C., that on a shipment of lumber from South Wellington to Merritt, B.C., consigned to the C.P.R. Company, care Kettle Valley Railway Company, they were refused the company's special "construction" rate, except from Vancouver to Merritt. (File No. 24644.)

See judgment of Asst. Chief Commissioner Scott, Appendix "C," setting out that no order will be made in this matter as the board has no jurisdiction over the contract between the parties.

5256. Application by Union Steamship Co., for approval of a plan of an overhead foot bridge from the foot of Carroll street to the premises of the company on the water front and over the tracks of the C.P.R. (File No. 12233.)

No order made. Applicant company to file and serve formal application.

5257. Application of the municipality of Langley, B.C., regarding highway crossings over the V.V. & E. Ry. (File No. 25283.)

No order made. Railway company to look into the matter with a view to having it satisfactorily settled, and advise the Board.

5258. Application of the Board of Trade of Alberni, B.C., for an order directing the Esquimalt & Nanaimo Railway Company (C.P.R.) to install a permanent station agent at Port Alberni, B.C. (File No. 20331.)

Judgment reserved. Referred to Chief Operating Officer Spencer for report.

5259. Application of the Corporation of the Township of Esquimalt, B.C., for an order directing that proper station accommodation and facilities be provided by the Esquimalt and Nanaimo Railway Company on their line of railway at junction with Admirals Road. (File No. 23355.)

Order made directing that the E. & N. Ry. Co., forthwith stop its passenger trains on flag at Admirals Road in the township of Esquimalt, B.C., and construct a flag station shelter at that point; work to be completed within 60 days after the approval of the plan. See Order 23214.

5260. Application of the Town of Courtenay, B.C., for an order directing the Esquimalt and Nanaimo Railway Company to permit the Provincial Government to make a road from the company's freight shed in a northwesterly direction to the Lake Trail, a distance approximately of 900 feet, so as to obviate the haul not necessary from the Lake Trail Road to the freight shed of approximately 5,700 feet. (File 22804.)

Application dismissed.

5261. Application of the municipal council of Duncan, B.C., for an order amending order of the Board No. 22817, in *re* dangerous crossing of Esquimalt and Nanaimo

Railway over the Victoria and Campbell River Trunk Road, south of Duncan, B.C. (File No. 9437-1143.)

Order made directing that the E. & N. Ry. install by the 23rd February, 1915, an improved type of automatic bell at the said crossing, and maintain the said bell at its own expense, 20 per cent of cost of installation to be paid out of The Railway Grade Crossing Fund. Order 22817 rescinded. See Order 23058.

5262. *Re* Tariff permitting dried fruit and liquors being mixed with carloads of groceries in fifth class. (File No. 18755-21.)

Application to be put in writing and then considered by the Board.

5263. *Re* cost of maintaining crossings at Chemanus and Duncan. (Case 3339.)

Order made directing the municipality to move the crossing from its present location to a point 1,350 feet south of Mile Post 41. Order No. 6642 rescinded. See Order No. 20812.

5264. Application by Indian Commissioner (Victoria, B.C.) concerning the fencing of certain Indian lands on the railways on Vancouver Island. (File No. 9994-199.)

Mr. McKenna, Indian agent, to file a statement.

5265. Application of the Provincial Government of British Columbia to grant permission to the C.P.R. to issue free transportation to persons without funds in Hosmer, B.C. (File No. 25349.)

Board stated that it would offer no objection to any arrangement the railway company and the Government of British Columbia might make in regard to the matter.

5266. Complaint of the Massey-Harris Company of Brantford, Ont., regarding connection of the Lake Erie and Northern Railway with the Toronto, Hamilton and Buffalo Railway and construction of the L. E. & N. Ry., through the Massey-Harris Company's lands in the city of Brantford, Ontario. (Files Nos. 18034-74 and 18034-31.)

Stands. Parties to endeavour to settle. If no settlement reached matter will be heard at sittings of the Board in Toronto on the 11th inst.

5267. Complaint of the Kingston Board of Trade that the Grand Trunk Railway Company is about to discontinue its train service leaving Kingston at 6 a.m. daily, except Sunday, and leaving Toronto 6 p.m. daily, except Sunday. (File No. 21243.)

No order made. Board directed that the Kingston Board of Trade be sent a copy of the evidence.

5268. Complaint of James Torrance, M.P.P., and James B. Lackie, Newton, Ont., against change of train service on the G.T.R. between Listowel and Stratford.

Board directed that service be given for high school pupils by way freight until the 18th December.

5269. Application of the Lachine, Jacques Cartier and Maisonneuve Ry. Co., under section 159, for approval of the location of the right of way across the lands of the Montreal Tramways Company in lot No. 340 of the parish of St. Laurent, P.Q. And application of the Montreal Tramways Company for a further hearing of said application. (File No. 14329.15.)

Board's engineer to furnish an estimate of the cost of raising the grade sufficiently to give a clearance of 15 feet 6 inches or a clearance of 21 feet 6 inches above the ground.

5270. Application of the Yukon Gold Company, under sections 26 and 167, for an order requiring the Klondike Mines Railway Company at its own expense, to elevate its tracks to an average height of fifteen feet above their present level over the following sections of the railway situate in Bonanza creek, in the Yukon Territory, namely: From the Upper Boundary line of claim 80 to the Lower Boundary line of claim 97 below discovery and from the Upper Boundary line of Claim 20 to the Lower Boundary line of Claim 29 below discovery. (Adjourned hearing.)

See judgment of Chief Commissioner. Appendix "C."

5271. Application of the Corporation of the City of Hamilton, Ont., for an order directing the Hamilton Radial Electric Railway Co., to carry out the provisions of Order No. 15241, in connection with the construction of a highway from the northerly terminus of Birch avenue to Gilkison street, Hamilton, Ontario. (File No. 17347.)

Order made directing the Hamilton Radial Electric Railway Company to relocate its tracks on the ground provided for it on Sherman Inlet in the city of Hamilton, and the Hamilton Cataract Power, Light and Traction Co., to remove its transmission line to the new location. Work to be completed by May 1, 1915. See Order 23219.

5272. Application of the Corporation of the City of Hamilton, Ont., for an Order directing the G.T.R. Company to establish and maintain gates with watchman where the main line of the company crosses Gage avenue, formerly Trolley street, being the original allowance for road between lots 6 and 7, in the township of Barton, now in the city of Hamilton, Ont. (File No. 9437-844.)

Order made directing the G.T.R. to install gates at the said crossing to be operated by day and night watchmen. Work to be completed by June 1, 1915. Twenty per cent of cost of installation to be paid out of The Railway Grade Crossing Fund. See Order No. 23030.

5273. Application of the Corporation of the City of Hamilton, Ont., for an Order directing the T. H. & B. Ry. Co., and the Canadian Pacific Railway Company to construct a new highway bridge carrying the line of King street, in the city of Hamilton, over the tracks of the company at the intersection of King street and the Toronto Branch of the T. H. & B. Ry. Company. (Adjourned hearing.) (File No. 24499.)

Judgment reserved. Referred to the Board's engineer for report.

5274. Petition of W. O. Sealey and others, residents and property owners in the vicinity of Hunter street, Hamilton, Ont., *re* railway traffic on Hunter street and asking that the level crossings along Hunter street should be abolished by depressing and covering the railway tracks of the Toronto, Hamilton & Buffalo Ry. Co. (File No. 20161.)

Stands adjourned pending effort on the part of the parties interested to reach a settlement.

5275. Application of the T. H. & B. Ry. and the G. T. R. Companies, under sections 26, 222, and 227, for authority to discontinue operating over the sidings or spurs from the railways of the said applicants upon the premises of the Berlin Machine Works, Limited, in the city of Hamilton, Ont. (File No. 6664, Case No. 2818.)

Reserved, parties to submit further argument.

5276. Application of the rural municipality of Brokenshell No. 68, Sask., for an order directing the Canadian Northern Railway Company to build a bridge over a creek at mileage 5·2 on its Moosejaw subdivision where the railway company have taken the road allowance.

And application of the C.N.R. Co. under section 237, for authority to cross and divert the north and south road between sections 10 and 11-7-18 W. 2 M. Sask. (File No. 8262.52.)

Order made dismissing the application, but authorizing the C. N. R. Co. to cross and divert the north and south road as applied for. Work to be completed by May 1, 1915. See Order 23085.

5277. Petition of the residents of the city and district of Moosejaw, Sask., for an order directing the Canadian Pacific Railway Company to construct a subway under its tracks at Seventeenth avenue, Moosejaw, Sask. (File No. 18620.)

Order made refusing application for subway, the city of Moosejaw to place a man at the crossing for three or four days for the purpose of preparing and submit-

ting to the Board a statement of the traffic at the crossing. The C.P.R. to send Board statement of trains that pass over crossing for one week.

5278. Application of the town of Weyburn, Saskatchewan, for a transfer track between the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway and the Canadian Pacific Railway Companies at Weyburn, Sask. (File No. 6713·70.)

Application withdrawn.

5279. Application of the Carnduff Board of Trade and village adjacent to Frobisher, Sask., for an order directing that a transfer switch be constructed between the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway and the Canadian Pacific Railway Companies at Frobisher, Sask. (Re-hearing.) (File No. 6713.73.)

Board decided that matter should be allowed to stand. See judgment of Commissioner A. S. Goodeve, dated January 24, 1915. Appendix "C."

5280. Application of the Board of Trade of Moosejaw, Sask., for an order directing the Canadian Northern and Canadian Pacific Railway Companies to establish a transfer track at Rosetown, Sask. (File No. 6713·39.)

See judgment of Commissioner A. S. Goodeve, Appendix "C."

5281. Application of the Moosejaw Board of Trade, Moosejaw, Sask., for an order directing the Canadian Pacific, Canadian Northern, and Grand Trunk Pacific Railway Companies to establish transfer tracks for interswitching purposes at Moosejaw, Sask. (File No. 6713.68.)

Order made dismissing the application.

See order No. 22098.

5282. Complaint of the Board of Trade and city of Moosejaw, Sask., relative to delay by the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway Company in completing its line to Moosejaw and the erection of a station there, and the taking up of expropriation proceedings to take the additional lands required for terminal facilities in the city of Moosejaw, Sask. (File No. 10863.62.)

Board decided matter should be allowed to remain in abeyance for the present. Railway companies to endeavour to come to a satisfactory arrangement in regard to joint terminals.

5283. Application of Messrs. S. A. Hamilton Company, Ltd., of Moosejaw, Sask., for a transfer track between the Canadian Northern and Canadian Pacific Railway Companies at Hawick, Alberta, or as an alternative, an order for the issuance of a joint freight tariff on coal by the Canadian Northern Railway and Canadian Pacific Railway Companies between Drumheller and Moosejaw, Sask., via the City of Calgary, Alberta. (File No. 6713.91.)

Order made dismissing the application. See order 23076.

5284. The Dominion Express Company will be required to speak to the question whether the words "or from conditions beyond its control" in clause (C), and the words "beyond its control" in clause (H), rule 5 of the Terms and Conditions embodied in the Express Merchandise Receipt, exempting the said company from liability for loss, damage or delay where negligence does not arise by default of the express company, but by default of the railway company. (File No. 3507, case No. 219.)

Judgment reserved.

5285. Complaint of J. E. Neuert of Invermay, Sask., against the Canadian Northern Railway Company proposed closing of crossing at roadway between sections 2 and 11, W. 2 M., at Invermay, Sask. (File No. 342.4.)

Order made authorizing the Canadian Northern Railway Co. to construct a highway crossing over its tracks at the point in question. See order 23178.

5286. Petition of the rural municipality of Abernethy, No. 186, on behalf of farmers of the Balcarres district, for an order directing the Canadian Pacific Railway Company to construct a crossing between sections 22 and 23-21-12 W. 2 M., at a

point west of Balcarres, Sask., at the water tank known as "Cotton." (File No. 965.25).

Order made directing the C.P.R. Co. to construct a diversion of the highway as therein set forth, work to be completed by May 15, 1915, subject to the conditions set forth in the order. See Order 23398.

5287. Application of Joseph James, of Actinolite, Ontario, for a settlement of the minutes of the order in connection with alleged trespass on the property of the applicant, lots 2 and 3, concession 4, township of Elzévir, Ont., by the Bay of Quinte Railway Company. (Adjourned hearing.) (File No. 369.)

Order made directing the Bay of Quinte Railway Company to remove any station or building off the lands of the applicant and restraining them from erecting any station buildings or freight sheds on that part of the located line of the company on the property of the applicant south of the old right of way of the Toronto and Ottawa railway. Permission given to applicant to construct a subway subject to conditions set forth in order. See Order 23040.

5288. In *re* highway crossing of the Grand Trunk Railway Company over the first highway east of Clarkson station, Ontario.

NOTE.—The board will consider the matter of the distribution of costs. (File No. 9437.802.)

See judgment of the Chief Commissioner. Appendix "C."

5289. Application of the Grand Trunk Railway Company for approval of renewal of bridge No. 317 across public highway at mile post 91.75 near Wyevale, county of Simcoe, 14th district, Ontario. (File No. 24775.)

Order made granting the application.

5290. Complaint of the township of Amaranth, Ontario, against the C. P. R. Co.'s bridge No. 6.3, on its Teeswater subdivision, and that the conditions are such that the railway bridge renders the highway unsafe for travel. (File No. 5568.4.)

Engineers of the parties interested to endeavour to come to an understanding in this matter.

5291. Application of the London and Lake Erie Railway and Transportation Company, under section 167, for an order approving change in location of the proposed connection with the Michigan Central Railroad Company within the city limits of the city of St. Thomas, Ontario, and for an order authorizing a connection with the same company at the west end of the city of St. Thomas, Ontario. (File No. 6713.36.)

Board directed that an order issue upon conditions as settled by the board.

5292. Application of Isaac Roskelly Landmaid, of the township of Whitby, Ontario, under section 263, for an order directing the Toronto Eastern Railway Company to provide and construct a suitable farm crossing where the company's railway intersects his farm on lot 20, concession 2, township of Whitby, Ontario. (File No. 15881.62.)

No order made, the railway company agreed to bring the crossing up to the standard required by the Board as soon as the weather conditions permit.

5293. Application of the residents in the neighbourhood of Listowel and Stratford for continuance by the Grand Trunk Railway Company of mixed train service after the end of the present school term. (File No. 25212.)

Order made directing the G. T. R. Co. to change the time of its train No. 191 to leave Stratford 7.50 a.m. and arrive at Palmerston 9.15 a.m., timing it at Listowel 8.45 a.m. or 8.48 a.m. if desired to meet the opposing train at the latter time. See order No. 23081.

5294. Complaint of the Board of Trade and town of Deseronto, Ont., against the train service at Deseronto, inaugurated by the Canadian Northern Ontario Railway Company, as shown in its new time table effective October 19, 1915. File No. 17090.)

See judgment of Chief Commissioner, dated February 19, appendix "C," to the effect that under the circumstances it is not possible for the board to make any order, but directing that the present service of the railway company must not be further reduced.

5295. Application of the C. L. O. & W. Ry. Co., for authority to close George street, Cobourg, Ontario, on a line immediately south of the C. L. O. & W. Ry. tracks to a point on a line with the north boundary of the G. T. R. Co.'s right of way in the town of Cobourg, Ontario. (File No. 3701.282.)

Board directed that the G. T. R. Co. have an opportunity of electing to move the stationmaster's house and to take the property from the C. P. R. Co.

5296. Application of the C. P. R. Co., for rehearing in the matter of the crossing of Dundas street by the C. P. R. in the township of Toronto, Ontario, authorized to be constructed by Order No. 21913; also consideration of the matter of protection of the C. P. R. crossing at Hurontario street, being between lots 15 and 16, concession 1, township of Toronto, mile 15·25. (File 22282.)

Order made rescinding order No. 21931 upon the condition that the applicant company install by July 20 an automatic bell at the said crossing. See order 23726.

5297. Application of the municipality of Scarboro, Ontario, for an order directing the C. L. O. & W. Ry. Co., to construct a subway under its railway between concessions 3 and 4, opposite the side road between lots 12 and 13, concession 4, at mileage 180·69; and application of the C. L. O. & W. Ry. Co., under section 237, for authority to cross the highway between concessions 3 and 4, township of Scarboro, county of York, at mileage 180·69 from Glen Tay, and to divert the said highway in a northeasterly direction to the road allowance between lots 12 and 13, concession 4, in the said township, and to close up that portion of the said road allowance lying within the company's right of way, and also to construct its line of railway across the said road allowance. (File No. 3701·124.)

Application dismissed.

5298. Application of the corporation of the city of Toronto, Ontario, under sections 237 and 238, for authority to reconstruct the bridge at Moore Avenue, partly in the city of Toronto and partly in the township of York, carrying the highway over the tracks of the belt line of the Grand Trunk Railway Company.

(Note). The board will consider the question as to whether the 20 per cent directed by order No. 22304, dated July 31, 1914, to be paid by the township of York should be paid by the township of York or the county of York. (Adjourned hearing.) (File No. 23190.)

Order made authorizing the city of Toronto, at its own expense to make the necessary repairs to the sidewalks on the bridge at Moore ave. Order No. 22305 rescinded. See Order No. 23053.

5299. Application of the G.T.R. Co., under section 222, for authority to construct a siding and spurs therefrom from a point on the Toronto Belt Line Railway west of Yonge Street, in the city of Toronto, thence extending to and into the premises of the Elias Rogers Coal Co. (File No. 22333·18.)

Application dismissed.

5300. Complaint of the Canada Foundry Co., Ltd., of Toronto, Ontario, relative to agreement between the applicants and the Michigan Central Railroad Company in connection with siding to structural steel plant at Shipyard, Ontario. (Adjourned hearing.) (File No. 22327.)

Judgment reserved.

5301. Application of the city of Toronto, Ontario, for an order regulating and limiting the use of steam whistles and the ringing of bells on engines, within the limits of the city of Toronto. (File No. 8342·4.)

Judgment reserved. Board's Chief Traffic Officer to report in the matter.

5302. Railway companies subject to the jurisdiction of the board will be required to speak to the question as to why in the case of a steam railway crossing an electric railway, where there is a heavy movement by the electric railway and only an infrequent movement by the steam railway, the employees on the train of the steam railway should not operate the plant when desiring to make a crossing, leaving it normally clear for the electric railway. (File No. 25177).

See judgment of Chief Commissioner, Appendix "C".

5303. Application of the Board of Trade of Toronto, Ont., for an order adding crayons to the stationery list of the Canadian freight classification. (File No. 19367-42.)

Application dismissed.

5304. Complaint of the Milton Pressed Brick Company, against the proposed increase in the rate of the G. T. R. and C. P. R. companies on brick from Milton to Toronto, from 3 cents to 3½ cents per 100 lbs.; the schedules covering which were suspended by the Board's Order No. 19973 of August 1, 1913. (Re-hearing.) (File No. 22583.)

No action necessary, the Grand Trunk & Canadian Pacific Railway Companies having advised the Board that their new tariff on building material, effective January 15, 1914, shows the rate on brick carloads from Milton to Toronto 3½ cents and that this was an error and that the rate of 3 cents has been restored.

5305. Complaint of the Milton Pressed Brick Company, and the Toronto Pressed Brick and Terra Cotta Company, against the increase of one half cent per 100 lbs., in the special mileage rates on brick since August 15, 1914, for distances over 90 miles to 750 miles. (File No. 24852.)

Judgment reserved.

5306. Application of the Halton Brick Company for restoration of the rate of 3 cents per 100 lbs. on brick from Terra Cotta, Ontario, to Toronto, which rate was advanced to 3½ cents August 1, 1912 (Adjourned at Toronto sittings, September 22, 1914.) (File No. 24368.)

No action necessary, the Graud Trunk and Canadian Pacific railway companies having advised the board that their new tariff on building material, effective January 15, 1915, shows the rate on brick carloads from Milton to Toronto 3½ cents and that this was an error and that the rate of 3 cents has been restored.

5307. Complaint of the Canadian Manufacturers' Association and the Toronto Board of Trade against the increased rates on brick and sand from Cooksville to Toronto which were suspended by the Board's Order No. 21327 of February 10, 1914. (File No. 23832.)

No action necessary, the Grand Trunk and Canadian Pacific Ry. Cos. having advised the Board that their new tariff on building material, effective January 15, 1915, shows the rate on brick carloads from Milton to Toronto, 3½ cents, and that this was an error, and that the rate of 3 cents has been restored.

5308. Complaint of the Canadian Manufacturers' Association and the York Sand and Gravel Company against the increased rates on brick from Port Credit to Toronto, and on sand from York to North Toronto, which were suspended by the Board's Order No. 21326 of February 10, 1914. (File No. 23833.)

Judgment reserved as to first part of application. Second part will be considered with the general question. Mr. Cowan to be at liberty to put in further evidence.

5309. Complaint of F. A. Fish, of Toronto, that on coal ex-Niagara frontier, consigned to Toronto for furtherance, and which is transferred in the same cars for Canadian Northern destinations, paying the published tariff rate of each company, the Canadian Northern illegally makes a "diversion" charge of $3 per car at Toronto. (File No. 24607.)

Application dismissed.

5310. The Railway Companies will be required to justify the proposed cancellation, January 1, of the arrangements whereby mixed carloads of foreign and native liquors, and mixed carloads of 5th class groceries and 4th class dried fruits, are carried at their respective carload rates between points west of and including Port Arthur, and thereto from eastern shipping points. (File No. 18755-21.)

Order to go for further suspension until the new classification is considered.

5311. Application of the city of Toronto, Ont., for certain extensions to the free area at Toronto within which the tolls of the express companies include collection and delivery, the said area being defined by the Board's Order 16468, of May 6, 1912. (Rehearing.) (File No. 4214-150.)

Judgment reserved.

5312. Complaint of the C.P.R. Co., against the Ontario Hydro-Electric Power Commission constructing power crossing over the C.P.R. at mileage 0·62, St. Mary's subdivision, without regard for the order of the Board respecting clearance of wires. (File No. 25251.)

Hydro-Electric to bring the crossing up to standard requirements within ten days and to notify the Board when this is done so that an inspection can be made.

5313. Application of the corporation of the city of Toronto, Ont., under section 237, for an order authorizing the construction of a subway under the tracks of the Grand Trunk Railway Company at Main street, Toronto, Ont. (File No. 24822.)

Struck off the list.

5314. Complaint of the Board of Trade of Fort Frances, Ont., against discontinuance by the Canadian Northern Railway Company, November 28, 1914, of local passenger and mail trains, Nos. 21 and 22, between Winnipeg and Fort Frances. (File No. 25230.)

Complaint struck off the list.

5315. Application of the Canadian Oil Companies, Ltd., for authority to construct a spur track crossing Gordon avenue, Winnipeg, Manitoba, to and into the premises of the Canadian Oil Companies, Ltd., from the line of the Canadian Pacific Railway Company. (File No. 22318-24.)

No order made. Leave given to the applicant companies to renew the application when conditions warrant it.

5316. Application of the city of Winnipeg, Manitoba, for certain extensions to the express cartage limits as fixed by Order No. 22246.

Also, application of G. J. Robins, of 696 Mulvey avenue, Winnipeg, for inclusion of the said address within the said free area. (File No. 4214-145.)

Application withdrawn.

5317. Application of the C.P.R. Co., for an order authorizing it to remove spur tracks at Stonewall, constructed for John Gunn and H. Williams and Co., also spur at Airedale, constructed for Williams Quarry Co. Also spur at Gunns, constructed for John Gunn; also spur at Dunton, constructed for Donald Gunn; all now used by the Manitoba Quarries, Ltd. (File No. 25167.)

Struck off the list with permission to have the matter brought up again by either party upon notice.

5318. Application C.P.R. to take up spur track at Tyndall, Man., constructed by the Company for John Gunn. (File No. 25322.)

Struck out. To be brought up on the request of either party on notice.

5319. Application of the C.P.R. Co. for authority to remove spur track at Tyndall, Man., constructed for the Tyndall Quarries, Ltd. (File No. 25324.)

Struck out. To be brought up on the request of either party on notice.

5320. Application on behalf of certain property owners in the city of Brandon, *in re* Order of the Board No. 17210, dated August 7, 1912.

Order made.

5321. Complaint Rainy River District Board of Trade, Fort Frances, Ont., against the discontinuance of the Canadian Northern Railway Company's Nos. 21 and 22 between Winnipeg and Fort Frances. File No. 25230.

No order made.

5322. Application of the C.N.R. Co., for authority to remove the connection between the C.P.R. and the Winnipeg Joint Terminal tracks at Higgins avenue, Winnipeg, Man. (File No. 23815.)

Order made refusing the application. The parties are to endeavour to agree upon terms of use of the track north of Higgins ave. If parties cannot agree Board will fix the terms.

5323. Application of the city of Winnipeg for a subway at Maple street, Winnipeg, Man. (File No. 432-2.)

Order made refusing the application except as to the pedestrian subway. If the parties cannot agree upon the latter then the Board will settle any dispute.

5324. Application of the municipality of Assiniboia for the extension of express delivery limits or in the alternative for the establishment of branch offices or depots or Union Office or Union Depot. (File No. 4214-469.)

Judgment reserved. Board to visit the *locus*.

5325. Application of the Canadian Oil Companies, Limited, for authority to construct a spur track crossing Gordon ave., Winnipeg, Man., to and into the premises of the said Canadian Oil Companies, Limited, from the line of the C.P.R. (File No. 22318-24.)

No order made. Permission granted to the applicant companies to renew the application when the conditions warrant it.

5326. Grand Trunk Pacific Railway Co. to speak to the question of the method of operating the interlocking plant at Dewdney street, Regina, Sask. (File No. 21061.)

Judgment reserved.

5327. Applications of the municipality of West Kildonan, Manitoba, for crossings over the tracks of the Selkirk Branch of the C.P.R. at Enniskillen, Kenilworth ave., and Park Manor Boulevard, D. G. S. 29. (File No. 24875.)

Order made granting the application at the expense of the municipality. See Order 23141.

5328. Complaint of municipality of Riverside regarding the removal of C.N.R. station agent at Margaret, Man. (File No. 4293-28.)

Order made authorizing the C.N.R. to discontinue the station agent at Margaret until April 1, 1915. After that date caretaker to be appointed. See Order No. 23189.

5329. Request of C. N. R. to remove station agent from Lorette, Manitoba. File No. 4205-22.

Order made authorizing the Ry. Co. to discontinue the services of station agent at Lorette, province of Manitoba. Company to appoint a caretaker in his stead. See Order 23072.

5330. Application of the Fort William Board of Trade for an order directing the Canadian Pacific Railway Company to provide local freight sheds at Fort William, separate from wharf sheds. (File No. 24808.)

Application dismissed.

5331. Application of the Fort William Board of Trade for the abolition of the charge of one cent per 100 lbs., minimum $5 per car, for switching goods for or from steamers between sidings and docks at Fort William as shown in the C.P.R. Co.'s tariff C.R.C. No. W-1919, page 6. (File No. 24994.)

Order made refusing the application. See Order 23281.

5332. Application of the Fort William Board of Trade for an order requiring the railway companies to arrange for a cartage service at Fort William and Port Arthur, and to collect the cost of the said service from the consignees of the Fort William and Port Arthur shippers. (File No. 18663-38.)

Order made dismissing the application. See order No. 23280.

5333. Application of the Fort William Board of Trade for an order requiring the railway companies to include in their present rates westbound from Fort William the charges for wharfage on goods passing over their docks at Fort William and reshipped west. (File No. 24809.)

Order made refusing the application. See judgment of Asst. Chief Commissioner, dated February 4, 1915. Appendix "C." See order No. 23282.

5334. Application of the Board of Trade of Fort William, Ont., for an order rescinding order of the board No. 14988, of August 10, 1911, defining restricted limits for collection and delivery of express freight, and requiring express companies to collect and deliver throughout the corporate limits of Fort William, Ont. (File No. 4214.96.)

No order made.

5335. Complaint of the Board of Trade of Redcliff, Alta., that the additional tolls charged by the Canadian Pacific Railway Company for switching cars to and from the industrial spurs at Redcliff are excessive and discriminatory. (File No. 24517.)

Judgment reserved. C.P.R. Co. to furnish the Board with a statement showing the number of carloads shipped in from the 1st January, 1914, to the 30th November, 1914, and the rates charged.

5336. Application of the city of Medicine Hat, Alberta, for an order rescinding Order of the Board 19824, dated July 11, 1913, authorizing the construction of a subway where the tracks of the Canadian Pacific Railway Company cross (Esplanade) River street, in the city of Medicine Hat, Alberta.

This matter is set down for the purpose of considering the petition of the residents of the city of Medicine Hat and taking of evidence in regard to it. (File No. 21979.)

City to prepare plans of a bridge at Ottawa street and estimate of cost within three months and submit same to the Board. A copy of the plan to be sent to the C.P.R. and to Mr. O'Neail.

5337. Application of the Erie and Ontario Railway Company, under section 361, for sanction and approval of agreement of amalgamation between the Erie and Ontario Railway Company and the Toronto, Hamilton and Buffalo Railway Company. (File No. 25153.)

Order made granting application.

5338. Application of the Atlantic Fruit Company, New York, for the same rules, regulations and rates covering reconsignment and diversion of bananas, in carloads, as now apply to citrous fruits from California. (File No. 25022.)

Application dismissed without prejudice to the applicants renewing the same after the 1st February, 1915.

5339. Application municipality of West Kildonan for crossing over tracks of C.P.R. Co., Park Manor Boulevard, D.G.S. 29, Kildonan, Man. (File No. 24877.)

Application withdrawn.

5340. Application municipality of West Kildonan in the province of Manitoba, for authority to construct a highway crossing over the tracks of the Selkirk branch of the C.P.R. Co. at Kenilworth ave., D.G.S. 6, Kildonan, Man. (File No. 24876.)

Order made granting the application. See order 23141.

5341. Application of the Canadian Northern Ontario Railway Company for approval of location of its second track from point west of Wragg street, Trenton, Ontario, marked "A" to a point marked "F" near Joseph street, shown on plan filed with the Board, and for approval of crossing by the said tracks of Dundas street, King street and Joseph street, and for authority to run this track along Division street and Queen street, subject to terms of agreement dated the 24th of June, 1910. (File No. 22806.)

Order made in the terms of the agreement to be filed by the applicant.

5342. *Re* Moncton and Buctouche Railway Company and Buctouche Railway and Transportation Company agreement.

NOTE.—This matter is set down for the purpose of giving the Moncton and Buctouche Railway Company an opportunity of presenting an argument respecting the agreement. (File No. 16994.)

See judgment of Chief Commissioner, Appendix "C".

5343. In the matter of the height of platforms at outlying stations.

(Note.)—The Board will consider the question as to whether an order should issue directing the New York Central & Hudson River Railroad to raise its station platforms to the height of nine inches above rail level. (File No. 25130.)

Railway Company to put in baulk line.

5344. The Grand Trunk, Grand Trunk Pacific, Canadian Pacific, and Canadian Northern Railway Companies, or any of them, will be required to show cause why the standard regulation of the Board as to the opening of new lines should not be changed so as to provide that in addition to filing the standard mileage tariff, applicable to traffic on the portion of the railway to be opened, the appropriate class or town tariffs, the mileage commodity tariffs, and the special tariffs on grain to Fort William, etc., and on lumber from British Columbia, should also be filed. (File No. 25343.)

Order made. The Railway Companies subject to the Board's jurisdiction making application to open for traffic are required to publish and file appropriate supplementary special class or town tariffs, mileage commodity tariffs, and special tariffs on grain to the Lake Superior terminals, and on lumber from British Columbia. See general order 134.

5345. Railway Companies are required to speak to the question of having public time-tables printed and distributed for the public notice ten days before same take effect, and to furnish the Board with copies of working time-tables, or notices of cancellation of trains seven days prior to effective date. (Circular No. 138.) (File No. 24942.)

Board directed that the parties confer with the Board's chief operating officer and arrange the matter to his satisfaction.

5346. The Pere Marquette Railroad is required to speak to the proposed change of time January 4, trains 91 from London cancelled, Nos. 1 and 4, cancelled west of Blenheim, also Blenheim and Sarnia No. 14. (File No. 24942.)

Board directed that the parties confer with the Board's chief operating officer and arrange the matter to his satisfaction.

5347. Application of the Kettle Valley Railway Company, under section 227, for authority to cross with its tracks the right of way of the Canadian Northern Pacific Railway at Hope, B.C. (File No. 11738.118.)

Order made granting the application subject to conditions set forth in order. (See Order 23180.)

5348. Complaint of Robert Trudel *et al* against the withdrawal by the Canadian Northern Railway Company, September 19, 1914, of the second-class fare between Quebec and Valcartier. (File No. 25178.)

Judgment reserved.

5349. Complaint of Auger & Son and the D'Auteuil Lumber Company against the proposed advance in rates on pulpwood to Mechanicsville via Boston and Maine Railroad published in C. P. R. supplement 1 to C. R. C. No. E-2847 and Grand Trunk Supplement 14 to C. R. C. No. E-2588. (Adjourned hearing.) (File No. 25316.)

Board directed that tariffs be suspended pending decision of the Board.

5350. Hearing of the applications of the Taylor Milling & Elevator Company, and the Ellison Milling & Elevator Company of Lethbridge, Alberta, protesting against the proposed cancellation of the joint through rates from Lethbridge to points in British Columbia prescribed by the Board's order 20462 of October 2, 1913, the notice of

cancellation to take effect January 1, 1915, having been suspended by Order 22989, of December 17, 1914. (File No. 25273.)

Cancellation disallowed by consent of parties, the original tariffs to remain in force.

5351. Application of the Toronto Board of Trade for an order disallowing supplement No. 5 to G. T. R. Tariff C. R. C. No. E-2859, supplement 15 to C. P. R. Tariff C. R. C. No. E-2715, and supplement 2 to C. N. R. Tariff C. R. C. No. E-386, in so far as they propose, from the 26th instant to increase the special mileage rates on vegetables loaded in refrigerator cars to the regular classification ratings. (File No. 18855.8.)

Judgment reserved.

5352. Application of the China Clay Company, of Montreal, P.Q., for commodity rates on china clay from Huberdeau, P.Q., equal to or approximating the import rates on the same article from Montreal to Cornwall, Campbellford, Dundas, East Angus, Espanola, Georgetown, Hamilton, Merritton, Niagara Falls, Port Hope, St. Catharines, Sault Ste. Marie and Toronto. (File No. 24988.)

Order made dismissing the application. See Order No. 23448.

5353. Application of E. W. Roberts, of Montreal, P.Q., for a special winter rate on unrossed green pulpwood which shall equal that applied on dry peeled wood by applying the weight per cord of dry wood to the green wood. (File No. 25331.).

Judgment reserved.

5354. Application of the South Shore Board of Trade for detailed information to be shown on Bell Telephone Company's bills for long distance calls. (File No. 3574.135.)

Application withdrawn.

5355. Application of the city of Lachine, P.Q., under section 237, for an order directing the Grand Trunk Railway Company to open, provide and construct a suitable tunnel for public use at the intersection of 6th Avenue on the south side and of 7th Avenue on the north side of the railway, in the city of Lachine, P.Q.

(Note.) The board will consider the question of the distribution of costs. (File No. 9437.1191.)

Application granted subject to conditions set forth in order. (See Order 23369.)

5356. Application of John E. Molson, of Montreal, P.Q., respecting approval of span diagrams of Iberville and De Fleurimont streets, (Lachine, Jacques Cartier and Maisonneuve Railway Co.) in the city of Montreal, P.Q. (File No. 14329·13.)

Order made reseinding Orders 16181 and 17763 in so far as they authorize the said railway to be constructed across Iberville and De Fleurimont streets, in the city of Montreal. Applicant company authorized to cross Iberville street by means of a bridge. (See Order 23322.)

5357. Application of the Canadian Northern Quebec Railway Company, under sections 222 and 237, for authority to construct sidings across Stadacona and Marlboro streets in Hochelaga ward, Montreal, P.Q. (File No. 22681·25.)

Order made granting the application. See Order No. 23390.

5358. Application of the parish of St. Eustache for an order directing the C.N.R. to at all times keep the subway at Oka road near St. Eustache free from water and clear of snow, as in winter during the bad weather the road will be impassable on account of accumulation of snow. (File No. 2342·34.)

Judgment reserved. Board's engineer to report on question of drainage.

5359. Application of Narcisse Lalone, St. Genevieve, P.Q., under section 253, for an order directing the Canadian Northern Ontario Railway Company to provide and construct a suitable farm crossing across its railway at road on lot 92, parish of St. Genevieve, P.Q. (File No. 23948.)

Application struck off the list. Applicant to have right to reinstate it at any time.

5360. Application of the Canadian Northern Ontario Railway, under section 237, for authority to cross the St. Laurent Road in the town of Cartierville, county of Jacques Cartier, P.Q. (File No. 2342·105.)

Order made granting the application and rescinding Order of the Board No. 18384, dated December 23, 1912. (See Order No. 23279.)

5361. Application of the Canadian Northern Ontario Ry Co., under section 237, for authority to cross the Monkland Boulevard in the town of Cartierville, P.Q., in the county of Jacques Cartier, P.Q. (File No. 2342-110.)

Order made granting the application. See Order No. 23389.

5362. Application of the Canadian Northern Ontario Railway Company, under section 237, for authority to divert the Petit Bois Franc Road between the town of Cartierville and the parish of St. Laurent, P.Q., temporarily for the purpose of constructing a trestle and raising the grade of its railway at this point, no diversion to be authorized until such time as the Board decides the permanent nature of this crossing (File No. 2342-125.)

Order made granting the application. Applicant company to pay town of Cartierville the sum of $12,000 as soon as the Petit Bois Franc Road is legally closed at the point where the railway crosses the same. See Order 23298.

5363. Application of the Canadian Northern Ontario Ry., under section 237, for authority to cross and divert the Petit Bois Franc Road, on lots 39, 40 aud 44, and ditch across lot 44, in the town of Cartierville, county of Jacques-Cartier, P.Q. (File No. 2342-125.)

Order made granting application. Applicant company to pay to the town of Cartierville the sum of $12,000 as soon as the Petit Bois Franc Road is legally closed at the point where the railway crosses the same. (See Order 23298.)

5364. Application of the city of Montreal, P.Q., under section 237, for authority to extend as a public highway or street over the right-of-way of the Canadian Northern Quebec Railway Co., at Cadillac street, Longue Pointe Ward, Montreal, P.Q. (File No. 25054.)

Order made granting application. (See Order 23233.)

5365. Complaint of the town of Lasalle, P.Q., against the diversion of St. Patrick street, Lasalle, P.Q., by the Canadian Pacific Railway Company in connection with the construction of the Lachine canal bridge without permission from the municipality. (File No. 1780.)

Judgment reserved. Board's engineer to make inspection and report.

5366. Application of the City of Montreal, P.Q., for an order directing the Canadian Pacific Railway Company to erect gates at Cote des Neiges Road, Cote des Neiges Ward, City of Montreal, P.Q., where same is crossed by the tracks of the Canadian Pacific Railway Company. (File No. 9437-565.)

Order made amending Order 12321 by providing that during the season of navigation the crossing be protected by watchmen between the hours of 7 a.m. and 7 p.m. daily.

5367. Application of the Ontario & Quebec Railway Company (C.P.R.) under section 237, for authority to construct a fourth track of its main line, Eastern Division, across part of Prospect Street, in the City of Westmount, P.Q. (File No. 24940.)

Order made granting the application. See Order No. 23897.

5368. Application of the Canadian Pacific Railway Company, under section 29, for an order rescinding Order No. 6147, dated January 21st, 1909, as amended by Order No. 10100, dated March 15th, 1910, in so far as said order refers to the charge imposed for stop-over at Cartier, Ont., on western grain and grain products in carloads consigned to Cartier "for orders" and further authorizing the applicant company to charge the following tolls in addition to stopover and car service charges, as provided in its tariffs, on all cars remaining on haud at Cartier awaiting furtherance orders after the expiration of 72 hours from the time of arrival, viz.:—for the first two days—$1.00 per car per day or part thereof, and for each succeeding day—$2.00 per day or part thereof. (File No. 8641.)

Judgment reserved. Matter referred to the Board's chief traffic officer to report on.

5369. Continuation of the inquiry into the tolls and practices with respect to interswitching. (File No. 6713. Case No. 2846.)

Judgment reserved.

5370. Complaint of the Montreal Corn Exchange Association against the proposed increase in the rate on grain and grain products from Fort William to points in Ontario, Quebec and Maritime Provinces as published in Supplement 24 to C.P.R. Tariff C.R.C. No. E-2480. (Note.) The C.P.R. Company will be required to justify the proposed increase. (File No. 25483.)

No order made as to the furtherance or through rates. Railway company gave undertaking that supplements will be filed before the effective dates of the tariffs in question striking out from such tariffs the advances in local rates and restoring the existing local rates.

5371. Complaint of the Toronto Board of Trade and Dominion Millers' Association against the proposed increase in rates on grain and grain products from points in Ontario and Quebec to points in the Maritime Provinces published in C.P.R. Tariff C.R.C. No. E-2930 and the G.T.R. Tariff C.R.C. No. E-3060.

(Note.) The railway companies will be required to justify the proposed advances. (File No. 17112-1.)

No order made as to furtherance or through rates. Undertaking given that supplement will be filed before the effective date of tariff in question, striking out from such tariffs the advances in local rates and restoring the existing local rates.

5372. Complaint of W. S. Bilton, of Newboro, Ont., against the published rates on coal, as excessive, as follows:—

(a) Ferry rate, Ogdensburg, N.Y., to Prescott;

(b) G.T.R., Prescott to Lyn;

(c) C.N.R., Lyn to Newboro.

(File No. 25337.)

Order made directing the Grand Trunk & Canadian Northern railway companies to publish and file a tariff of joint rates to apply on coal in carloads of a minimum weight of 15 tons gross shipped from Prescott. See Order 23375.

5373. Complaint of the Hamilton & Toronto Sewer Pipe Co., Ltd., of Hamilton, Ontario, against the rate charged by the Grand Trunk Railway Company on clay from the complainant's new pit to Hamilton, Ont. (File 25459.)

No order made as to furtherance or through rates. Undertaking given that Supplement will be filed before the effective date of tariff in question, striking out from such tariffs the advances in local rates and restoring the existing local rates.

5374. Complaint of the Dominion Match Company, Limited, of Deseronto, Ontario, that the Grand Trunk and Canadian Northern railway companies have cancelled the joint rates between Deseronto, Ont., and points on the G.T.R. between Toronto, Ontario, and Montreal, P.Q. (File No. 25140.)

Struck off the list.

5375. Express companies subject to the jurisdiction of the Board will be required to speak to the question whether the words "or from conditions beyond its control" in clause (*c*), and the words "beyond its control" in clause (*h*), rule 5, of the terms and conditions embodied in the Express Merchandise Receipt exempting the companies from liability for loss, damage or delay where negligence does not arise by default of the Express Company, but by default of the railway company. (File No. 3507. Case No. 219).

Judgment reserved.

5376. Railway companies will be required to show why the recent increases in the international freight rates between Canada and the United States should be allowed to stand as filed with the board. File No. 23359.

Judgment reserved.

5377. Complaint of Geo. E. Earl and others, of Winchester, Ontario, against the proposed withdrawal by the Bell Telephone Company of its telephone service in that district. (File No. 3574-138.)

Application dismissed, board holding that it had no jurisdiction under the Railway Act to deal with the matter.

5378. Complaint of the Corporation of the Parish of St. Francois Xavier de Brompton, P.Q., that the right of way of the Canadian Pacific Railway Company is too close to the public highway at different points in that parish. (File No. 25011.)

Board decided that it would take up with the municipality the question of whether there is a cadastral plan showing the road at the two points in question referred to in the report of the Board's Engineer, and whether the railroad company has encroached on the road.

5379. Application of the Campbellford, Lake Ontario and Western Railway Company, under sections 167, 222, 237 and 227, for approval of two revisions of the applicant company's line as sanctioned by Order No. 21733 at points east and west of Eugenia street, Trenton, Ontario. (2) for approval of two connections with the Canadian Northern Ontario Railway Company to said town of Trenton; (3) for approval of the location of said proposed revisions on Ontario street, in said town of Trenton, Ontario; (4) authorizing the operation of said revisions and connections. (File No. 3701-379.)

Order made dismissing the application. See Order 23443.

5380. Application of the Canadian Pacific Railway Company, under section 222, for authority to construct the Longue Pointe spur from a point on its main line, in Hochelaga ward of the city of Montreal, P.Q., to a point in Longue Pointe ward, Montreal, P.Q. (Adjourned hearing.) (File No. 17716-12.)

Judgment reserved, the board to visit the *locus*.

5381. Application of the Canadian Pacific Railway Company, under section 237, for authority to construct and operate the Longue Pointe spur across the following streets and highways between mile 0·77 and 1·69, in the city of Maisonneuve, P.Q., Bourbonnière avenue, D'Orléans avenue, Charlemagne street, Lasalle avenue, Letourneau avenue, Bennett avenue, Aird, Fifth, Fourth, Third, Second and First avenues, in accordance with detail plans of the overhead structures at Bourbonniere avenue, D'Orléans avenue, Charlemagne street, Jeanne d'Arc avenue, Pie IX Boulevard, Desjardins avenue, Lasalle avenue and Letourneau avenue. (Adjourned hearing.) (File No. 17716-13.)

Judgment reserved, the board to visit the *locus*.

5382. Application of James McConkey, of the township of Brantford, Ontario, under section 237, for approval of the construction of highway crossing across the line of the Grand Trunk Railway Company at James street, Township of Brantford, and for leave to carry the highway across the tracks of the G.T.R. at said point. (File No. 23929.)

Board decided that no order should be made under existing conditions.

5383. Consideration of the matter of protection at the crossing of the Port Burwell branch of the Canadian Pacific Railway Co. over Port Burwell road, at mileage 32·7, Port Burwell Branch. (File No. 9437-801.

Judgment reserved.

5384. Application of the Lake Erie and Northern Railway Company, under section 237, for authority to cross Currier avenue, in the township of Brantford, Ontario. (File No. 18034-91.)

Application granted.

5385. Application of the Lake Erie and Northern Railway Company, for an order approving of the revision of the grade of the Lake Erie and Northern Railway through the city of Brantford, Ontario. (File No. 18034.80.)

Judgment reserved.

5386. Application of the Lake Erie and Northern Railway Company, under section 237, for authority to cross Mount Pleasant road in the township of Brantford, Ontario. (File No. 18034.87.)

Judgment reserved.

5387. Application of the Lake Erie and Northern Railway Company, under section 237, for authority to cross Graham avenue, in the township of Brantford, Ontario. (File No. 18034.85.)

Application granted.

5388. Application of the Lake Erie and Northern Railway Company, under section 237, for authority to cross Bellwood avenue, in the township of Brantford, Ontario. (File No. 18034.88.)

Application granted.

5389. Application of the Lake Erie and Northern Railway Company, under section 237, for authority to cross Harold avenue, in the township of Brantford, Ontario. (File No. 18034-89.)

Application granted.

5390. Application of the Lake Erie and Northern Railway Company, under section 237, for authority to cross George avenue, in the township of Brantford, Ontario. (File No. 18034.81.)

Application granted.

5391. Application of the Lake Erie and Northern Railway Company, under section 237, for authority to cross Stirton avenue, in the township of Brantford, Ontario. (File No. 18034.86.)

Application granted.

5392. Application of the Lake Erie and Northern Railway Company, under section 237, for authority to cross Wade street, in the township of Brantford, Ontario. (File No. 18034.90.)

Application granted.

5393. Application of the Lake Erie and Northern Railway Company, under section 237, for authority to cross Henry avenue, in the township of Brantford, Ontario. (File No. 18034.83.)

Application granted.

5394. Application of the Lake Erie and Northern Railway Company, under section 237, for authority to cross Wilson street, in the township of Brantford, Ontario. (File No. 18034.84.)

Application granted.

5395. Application of the Lake Erie and Northern Railway Company, under section 237, for authority to cross Searfe street, in the township of Brantford, Ontario. (File No. 18034.82.)

Application granted.

5396. Application of the Essex Terminal Railway Company for an order, under section 222, for authority to construct a branch line from a point on lot No. 59, town of Sandwich, formerly in concession 1, of the township of Sandwich, to and along Russell street from the northerly limit of said lot No. 59 to the southerly limit of Huron street. (File No. 3704 11.)

Order made refusing the application. See Order No. 23466.

5397. Application of the municipal corporation of the city of Windsor, Ontario, under sections 235-243, for an order directing the Michigan Central Railway Company to provide and construct a suitable level crossing over said company's line of railway at the intersection with Wyandotte street, Windsor, Ontario. (File No. 24283.)

Order made refusing the application but granting leave to cross the tracks of the Michigan Central Railway Co. at Wyandotte street by means of an overhead

crossing as provided by Order of the Board, No. 10235, dated April 19, 1910. See Order No. 23446.

5398. Application of the municipal corporation of the city of Windsor, Ontario, under sections 235-243, for an order directing the Canadian Pacific Railway Company to provide and construct a suitable bridge and crossing over the said company's line of railway at its intersection with London street, in the city of Windsor, Ontario. (File No. 9437.1128.)

Judgment reserved.

5399. Grand Trunk Railway Company will be required to justify the exclusion of team tracks from its interswitching service to or from the C.P.R. at Woodstock, Ontario, while performing such service at Lindsay, London, Montreal and Toronto under the provisions of Supplement No. 26 to its Tariff C.R.C. No. E-2457. (File No. 19801-70.)

No order necessary the G. T. R. Co. undertaking to restore the service as it was before without prejudice to the general question of interswitching now pending before the board.

5400. The Canadian Pacific Railway Company will be required to show cause why an order should not be made requiring them to maintain a signalman at the crossing of the Kingston and Pembroke railway over the tracks of the Ontario and Quebec railway at Sharbot Lake, Ontario. (File No. 25492.)

Judgment reserved.

5401. In the matter of the Order of the Board No. 14184, dated May 9, and 10, 1911, and the application of the Bell Telephone Company of Canada, in pursuance of the terms thereof, for an order rescinding said order in so far as it concerns the Ingersoll Telephone Company, Ltd., the Blenheim and South Kent Telephone Co., Ltd., the Peoples Telephone Company of Forest, Ltd., the Markham & Pickering Telephone Co., Ltd., the South Lambton Telephone Co-Operative Association, Ltd., the Niagara District Telephone Company, Ltd., the municipal corporation of the village of Brussels being the initiating municipality of the Brussels, Morris & Grey Municipal Telephone System, and the Wheatly Telephone Company, Ltd.

And in the matter of the application on behalf of the said telephone companies for an order varying said Order No. 14184 by reducing and making reciprocal the connecting toll or by eliminating the said toll altogether; and also by extending the operation of the said order to all independent systems competing with the Bell Telephone Company.

(Note.) The matter is set down to speak to the settlement of the terms of the order as based on what is contained in the judgment of the board on file 16171 and dated July 16, 1914. (File No. 16171.)

Judgment reserved.

5402. Application of the Canadian Pacific Railway Company for re-hearing in the matter of the crossing of Dundas street by the Canadian Pacific railway in the township of Toronto, Ontario, authorized to be constructed by Order No. 21913; also consideration of the matter of protection at the C.P.P. crossing at Hurontario street, being between lots 15 and 16, concession 1, township of Toronto, mile 15·25. (Adjourned hearing.) (File No. 22282.)

Order made rescinding Order No. 21931, dated May 29, 1914, upon condition that the applicant company install by the 20th July an automatic bell at the said crossing; 20% of the cost of installation to be paid out of The Railway Grade Crossing Fund and the balance by the applicant company. See Order No. 23726.

5403. Application of the corporation of the township of Niagara, Ont., under section 237, for an order directing the Michigan Central Railroad Company to provide and construct a suitable highway crossing where the company's railroad intersects the

public highway between lots 8 and 9, and known as the "Fisher Road" in the township of Niagara, Ont. (File No. 24512.)

Application withdrawn.

5404. Complaint of W. H. Bunting, St. Catharines, Ont., against the proposed increase in the rates on manure, C.L., from Toronto and Hamilton, for Canadian Northern delivery at St. Catharines and Niagara Falls, Ont., as published in G.T.R. Tariff C.R.C. No. E-3035.

(Note.) The Grand Trunk Railway Company will be required to justify the proposed advance. (File No. 6713-54.)

Order made disallowing proposed rate and restoring rate of two and three quarter cents per hundred pounds on a minimum of 60,000 pounds. Change effective 21st of April 1915. See Order 23507.

5405. Application of the township of Oro, Ont., for an interpretation of clause 4 of Order No. 12714, dated December 12, 1910, relative to use of old gravel pit, *in re* Raike's overhead crossing by the Grand Trunk Railway Company, north of Barrie, Ont.; also to have the G. T. R. Co., agree to maintain the bridge road and guard rail within the limits of their 66 feet right of way and the guard rail now erected on the north side of the track, the township to agree to maintain the guard rail and roadbed on south side of bridge; also to have the G.T.R. Co. furnish the township with a satisfactory deed of the new road. (File No. 9437-560.)

Matter referred to the board's chief engineer to take up with the engineer of the railway company. The railway company to submit to the board a draft deed of the new road proposed.

5406. Complaint of Captain Edward Elliott, owner of Lot 4, Block E.E., in the East Ward of the town of Lindsay, Ont., against the Georgian Bay and Seaboard Air Line Railway Company (C.P.R.) closing up the north end of Caroline street, in the town of Lindsay, Ont. (File No. 2100-10.)

Complaint dismissed without prejudice to the clerk of the town of Lindsay to make a further application for a crossing over the railway. See Order No. 23506.

5407. Complaint of the Ontario Commercial Travellers' Association, of London, Ontario, against the reduction of train service by the Grand Trunk Railway Company, and request for restoration of that company's former time-table of train leaving London for Owen Sound at 6 a.m., arriving in Owen Sound at 11.35 a.m., also train leaving London at 10 a.m., arriving in Stratford to connect with Port Dover, which used to go north to Owen Sound. (File No. 25447.)

Referred to board's chief operating officer to report on.

5408. Application of the London Railway Commission, of London, Ont., for an order granting the London and Port Stanley Railway Co. the right to operate its cars and trains, propelled by electric power, over the Grand Trunk Railway Company's tracks at London, Ont. (File No. 25649.)

Order made authorizing the applicant to take possession of the land belonging to the G.T.R. Co., set forth in the order; also authorizing the applicant to construct its tracks and erect poles along Bathurst street in the city of London. See Order No. 23753.

5409. Application of the Graham Company, Ltd., of Belleville, Ont., for 5th class rates on evaporated or desiccated vegetables, in carloads, to St. Lawrence and Atlantic ports for export. (File No. 19367-43.)

No order made. To be dealt with in connection with Eastern Rates Case.

5410 and 5411. Application of the G. T. Clarkson, trustee for the creditors of Lloyd & Sons, Limited, of the town of Trenton, Ont., for an order rescinding order of the board, No. 21971, *re* matter of C.L.O. & W. Ry., and expropriation of certain property in lots 3, 4 and 5, Ontario street, and part of lot 1A, concession 1, township of Murray, all in the town of Trenton, Ont. (File 3701-347.)

Order made that the application to restrict the right of expropriation be dismissed; provision made that the arbitration pending to determine the compensation to be paid in respect to the taking of petitioners land and for damages be continued as an arbitration under the Railway Act, subject to the provisions set forth in the order. See Order No. 23504.

5412. Complaint of F. A. Fish, of Toronto, Ont., that on coal ex-Niagara frontier, consigned to Toronto for furtherance, and which is transferred in the same cars for Canadian Northern destinations, paying the published tariff rate of each company, the Canadian Northern illegally makes a "diversion" charge of $3 per car at Toronto. (File No. 24607.)

Board decided it had no jurisdiction to order a refund.

5413. Application of J. H. Jones, of Toronto, Ont., under section 317, for an order directing the Grand Trunk Railway Company of Canada and Walter Mann, of the city of Toronto, to afford the applicant reasonable facilities for receiving and delivering traffic on private siding at Bloor street west, and for an order directing the said G.T.R. Co. and Walter Mann to pay damages to the applicant for failure to afford such damages. (File No. 25554.)

Order made directing applicant to pay G.T.R. Co. rent for the siding for last three and one-half years. Company to resume service forthwith. See Order No. 23503.

5414. Complaint of Christie, Henderson & Company, Limited, Toronto, Ont., that the Grand Trunk Railway Company refuse to make an allowance for 296 doors furnished for cars of lime shipped from Galt, Ont. (File No. 25541.)

Order made dismissing the application. See Order No. 23500.

5415. Application of the corporation of the city of Toronto, Ont., for an order directing the Bell Telephone Company of Canada to file with the board the tariffs of tolls, applying the same tolls to the territory recently annexed to that part of the city of Toronto formerly known as the town of North Toronto, as are now charged within the limits of the company's Toronto exchange for Toronto exchange services; the said tariffs to become effective on the date to be fixed by such order, and directing the company to charge only such tolls after the said date. (File No. 3574.74.)

Order made directing the Bell Telephone Company to file with the board tariffs of tolls, applying the same tolls to the territory recently annexed to that part of the city of Toronto formerly known as the town of North Toronto, as are now charged within the limits of the company's Toronto exchange for Toronto exchange services, such tariff to be effective January 1, 1916. See Order 23497.

5416. Application of the Canadian Pacific Railway Company, under section 29, for an order amending order of the board No. 22691 in the matter of the consideration of the question of the grade crossing by the tracks of the applicant company at Yonge street, North Toronto, Ont., so as to provide that the approach to the subway on the southerly side shall have a grade of five per cent instead of two and a half per cent as shown on the plan referred to in paragraph 1 of the said order. (File No. 9437.153.)

Order made dismissing the application. See order No. 23508.

5417. Application of the executive of the Toronto Civic Guild for an order directing the Canadian Northern and the Canadian Pacific Railway Companies to furnish to the city of Toronto particulars as to the location of the tracks and the grades to be established in carrying out the new railway work east of Yonge street, particularly at the intersections of Maclennan avenue, Sight Hill avenue and Summerhill avenue. (File No. 12021·70.)

Judgment reserved.

5418. Application of the corporation of the city of Toronto, Ont., under sections 237 and 257, for approval of plan showing the construction of a subway under the tracks of the Grand Trunk Railway Company at the proposed extension of Wilton avenue to connect with Dickens avenue, Toronto, Ont. (File No. 25450.)

Order made granting the application subject to conditions set forth in the order; 20 per cent of the cost of constructing the subway, not exceeding $5,000, to be paid out of The Railway Grade Crossing Fund; $10,000 to be paid by the G.T.R. Co., and the balance of the cost to be borne by the applicant. See Order 23505.

5419. Application of the city of Toronto, Ont., for approval of plans of reconstruction of the Bathurst Street bridge over the right of way of the Grand Trunk Railway Company and the Toronto Terminals Railway Company as shown on plans on profile with the board, and as to the question of the expense thereof. (File No. 25406.)

Struck off the list until with leave to applicant to have reinstated on notice.

5420. Application of the Canadian Pacific Railway Company for an amendment of order No. 10782, the said amendment to provide as to the division of responsibility for accidents due to the negligence of the gatemen at public crossing at Royce avenue, Toronto, Ont. (File No. 9437·149.)

Judgment reserved.

5421. Consideration of the matter of responsibility for accidents due to negligence of signalmen at diamond crossing. (File No. 15499.135.)

Struck off the list. Railway companies at liberty to bring the matter up at any time.

5422. Application of the Canadian Pacific Railway Company for an order in the North Toronto grade separation case directing the parties who are required under the judgment of the board to contribute to the cost of the work to pay to the C. P. R. Co. their proper proportion of the expense hitherto incurred upon receipt of duly certified accounts, such parties hereafter to pay their proper proportion of such work including land damages from time to time upon receipt of certified progress estimates showing the amount expended thereon until completed. (File No. 9437.153.)

Order made amending order No. 22691, dated October 9, 1914, to provide that the approach to the subway at Yonge street, North Toronto, on the southerly side shall have a grade of 5 per cent. See Order No. 23596.

APPENDIX "C."

APPLICATION OF THE FONTHILL GRAVEL COMPANY, LIMITED, FOR AN ORDER REDUCING THE RATES FROM FONTHILL TO TORONTO ON MOULDING SAND, OVER THE LINES OF THE NIAGARA, ST. CATHARINES AND TORONTO RAILWAY COMPANY AND THE GRAND TRUNK RAILWAY COMPANY.

Judgment, Mr. Commissioner McLean, February 9, 1914:

Complaint is made that the rate of $1 per ton on moulding sand from Fonthill to Toronto, which has been in force since July 1, 1912, is unreasonable; and it is urged that the rate of 90 cents per ton, which prior to the date in question had been in force, should be re-established.

The movement from Fonthill to Toronto is a two-line movement, with a total distance of 78 miles; 13 miles of this is on the line of the Niagara, St. Catharines and Toronto Railway Company from Fonthill to St. Catharines; the balance is over the line of the Grand Trunk Railway Company. The evidence submitted as to the value of the commodity is contradictory. It is stated by counsel for the applicants that this moulding sand is worth 75 cents per ton f.o.b. cars. There is also the statement that it is worth 90 cents. It has been ascertained by investigation that moulding sand used in Ottawa by various companies is obtained from such points as Albany, Cedar Hill, Mechanicsville, and South Amboy, N.Y., this sand being sold at 90 cents f.o.b. New York. Sand is a commodity which has a low value in a comparatively large bulk. Consequently it cannot bear as large a part of general costs as other more highly valued commodities.

At the same time, there must be considered the nature of the service performed by the railway, for the allegation that a commodity cannot be disposed of in the market at a profit on the existing rate, even if such allegation is found to be justified, is not necessarily conclusive of the unreasonableness of the rate. Whether or not an article can be disposed of at a profit may depend upon conditions for which the railway is in no way responsible. The obligation of the railway is as to the reasonableness of the charges for the service performed by it.

Toronto is a consumer of a very considerable amount of moulding sand. During the year ending December 31, 1912, there was shipped into Toronto 6,020 tons of moulding sand from the following points: Stamford, St. Catharines, Copetown, Hamilton, Stony Creek and Winona. The rates vary from 70 cents per ton in the case of the 39-mile haul from Hamilton, to $1 on the 95-mile haul from Stamford. Stamford is the most important shipping point on this list, since it supplied 3,400 tons out of the total, or approximately 55 per cent. The next most important point is St. Catharines, which is 65 miles from Toronto and pays a rate of 90 cents per ton. It supplied 915 tons. The shipments from Fonthill amounted to 86 tons.

The rates on moulding sand shipped into Toronto from the points mentioned in the preceding paragraph take into consideration supplies of this commodity from various sources competing in a common market. In the arrangement of rates on moulding sand, a special rate basis is used. The commodity is tenth class; but provision is made for lower rates, e.g., in Grand Trunk tariff C.R.C. E-2552, which quotes rates on building material, in which group moulding sand is included. Taking a mileage of 80 miles, the local mileage distance tariff and the special and competitive mileage basis under the G.T.R. tariff above mentioned work out as follows:

	Per ton.
Local mileage distance tariff	$2 00
Special and competitive mileage	1 30

The rate charged for the same mileage from Fonthill is $1 per ton.

In the arrangement of the rates from the Niagara district the rates have been grouped, St. Catharines being taken as a basing point. In building the rate from Fonthill, the practice as contained in the tariffs is to make the Fonthill rate 10 cents per ton over St. Catharines, when the St. Catharines rates are less than $1; but when the St. Catharines rates are $1 or over per ton the $1 rate applies to both points. The reason advanced for this arrangement is that on a 90-cent rate, the second carrier would, in order to allow the Niagara, St. Catharines and Toronto Railway Company the division asked for by it, have to shrink its own division of the rate too much.

While Fonthill has a two-line haul to Toronto, the sand may move from Stamford by not only a two-line haul but also by a three-line haul. There is available a route of 80 miles, 3 miles of which is on the Michigan Central, the balance being via the Grand Trunk. The three-line haul is made up as follows:

Stamford to Welland via M.C.R.	17 miles.
Welland to Hamilton via T. H. & B.	38 "
Hamilton to Toronto via C.P.R.	40 "

The route so furnished is 17 miles longer than the distance from Fonthill, while the rate is the same. The rate on the three-line haul from Stamford is, however, held down by the 80-mile movement on the two-line haul. While the Michigan Central may prefer the three-line to the two-line movement, since on the latter it would receive only the rate covered under the interswitching tariff, the distance on its lines being less than three miles, it is apparent that the mileage of the two-line haul holds down the rate of the longer three-line haul. The one-line haul of the Grand Trunk on moulding sand from St. Catharines to Berlin, a distance of 91 miles, is $1.10. Again, the one-line rate of the Grand Trunk from Hamilton to London, a distance of 76 miles, is $1. It has been recognized that a two-line or a three-line haul may, within limits, have a justification for being higher than the single line rate for the same distance. Here the rate for the two-line haul is the same as for the one-line haul.

Out of the rate of $1 from Fonthill, the Grand Trunk receives 78 cents for a distance of 65 miles. From Hamilton to Elora, a distance of 60 miles, it receives on moulding sand 90 cents. It does not appear that the division of the rate received by the Grand Trunk for this portion of the two-line haul is excessive when consideration is turned to what it receives for a substantially similar single line haul.

There remains, then, the consideration of the portion of the haul over the line of the Niagara, St. Catharines and Toronto Railway. In this short haul of 13 miles, the terminal cost plays a more important part in fixing the rate than if the haul were longer. This must manifestly be so since the terminal cost being fixed the shorter the mileage it has to be spread over the more important its effect is upon the total rate. The board in its interswitching order has recognized a charge of one cent per 100 pounds as proper for a 4-mile haul. This moulding sand loads about 30 tons to the car, which would give a charge of $6 for four miles. If the charge of 20 cents per ton for the 4-mile haul is reasonable, it would appear that while the interswitching charge is not necessarily conclusive as a measure of the line haul, the charge of 22 cents per ton for the haul of 13 miles is not an unreasonable one. I have not been able to get a single line rate exactly comparable with the Niagara, St. Catharines and Toronto division of the rate. A through rate should normally be less than the sum of the locals. In the local or single line rate, there are two terminals. In the through rate, made up of the haul over two lines, there is in each division of the through rate only one terminal. Bearing in mind, however, the difference between the local rate and the division of the through rate, the local rate is of interest for comparative purposes. Between Copetown and Paris, a distance of 18 miles, the single line rate of the Grand Trunk on moulding sand is 60 cents per ton. In the complaint

of the Clifton Sand, Gravel and Construction Company, File 18265, the board had before it complaints as to various rate points in connection with the movement of sand and gravel from Stamford. The board found, to cite one of the points, that the rate of 30 cents per ton from Stamford to Welland, a distance of 16·4 miles, was not unreasonable. This was a single line haul.

On full consideration of the situation it does not appear to me that the divisions of the through rate from Fonthill are unreasonable, and it consequently follows that the through rate itself is not unreasonable.

Chief Commissioner Drayton concurred.

Order issued, dismissing application.

(NOTE.—Judgment herein was not issued until July 25, 1914.) Reported in 17. Can. Ry. Cas., 248.

THE PORT HOPE TELEPHONE COMPANY, LIMITED, APPLIES TO THE BOARD UNDER AN ACT TO AMEND THE RAILWAY ACT, 7-8 ED. VII, CHAP. 61, SEC. 4, AND OTHER SECTIONS, FOR A RULING THAT THE APPLICANT COMPANY IS NOT A COMPETITIVE COMPANY IN COMPETITION WITH THE BELL TELEPHONE COMPANY OF CANADA, LIMITED, AND FOR AN ORDER DIRECTING A CONNECTION OF THE LINES OF THE TWO COMPANIES FOR THE PURPOSE OF INTERCHANGE OF BUSINESS BETWEEN THE TWO COMPANIES AT THE TOWN OF BOWMANVILLE, OR, IF THE BOARD SHOULD FIND THAT THE PORT HOPE TELEPHONE COMPANY, LIMITED, IS A SYSTEM OPERATING IN PART OR PARTS IN COMPETITION WITH THE SAID THE BELL TELEPHONE COMPANY OF CANADA, LIMITED, AND IN PART OR PARTS NOT IN COMPETITION WITH THE BELL TELEPHONE COMPANY OF CANADA, LIMITED, THEN FOR A DECLARATION TO THAT EFFECT, AND AN ORDER THAT THE SAID TWO COMPANIES SHALL CONNECT THEIR LINES AT THE SAID TOWN OF BOWMANVILLE, FOR THE PURPOSE OF AN INTERCHANGE OF BUSINESS BETWEEN THOSE PARTS OF THEIR SAID LINES RESPECTIVELY AS SHALL BE FOUND NOT TO BE IN COMPETITION THE ONE WITH THE OTHER.

Judgment, Commissioner McLean, March 30, 1914.

It is unnecessary to examine into the merits of the present application, unless the board has jurisdiction.

By 7-8 Edward VII., chap. 61, the jurisdiction of the board in regard to telephones is defined. The jurisdiction which is given follows in a general way that given in regard to railways. It is, however, recognized by the exclusion of certain sections of the Railway Act that the provisions of the Railway Act applicable to railways are not applicable to telephones in their entirety. The fact that there is not an identity of conditions as between telephone and railway service is further emphasized by section 5 of 7-8 Edward VII, chap. 61, which, after setting out certain sections of the Railway Act which do not apply to telephones, continues by saying that, subject to such exceptions—

> "The several provisions of the Railway Act. . . . in so far as reasonably applicable and not inconsistent with this part or the Special Act shall apply to the jurisdiction of the board. . . . . ."

A consideration of the scope of the jurisdiction as set out in section 5 above mentioned shows that it is primarily a rate jurisdiction which is here conferred upon the board. Further limitations appear on further analysis. The jurisdiction so set out is to—

> "apply generally to companies within the purview of this Part."

Subsection (*b*) of the interpretation clause of this legislation states—

> "Company.....includes.....telephone companies and every company and person within the legislative authority of the Parliament of Canada having power to construct a.....telephone system or line and to charge.....telephone tolls."

It appears, therefore, that the provisions of the Railway Act are applicable only in so far as companies are concerned, to companies within the legislative authority of the Parliament of Canada. It follows, therefore, that a telephone company not within such authority cannot invoke the power of the board on an allegation of discriminatory treatment on the part of a telephone company subject to the board's jurisdiction. That is to say, the Bell Company may make an agreement with one provincially chartered company, while it may refuse to make an agreement with another which is alleged to be similarly situated.

There has been worked out, and is available, a form of agreement for "non-competing" companies. It should at the same time be pointed out that there is nowhere in the Railway Act any definition of a competing company in so far as a telephone company is concerned. It is true that in the decision of the board which granted connection on terms to certain "competing" companies, the word "competition" is used:

> "One of the outstanding matters and one that presents the greatest difficulty in connection with this question is the position taken by the Bell Telephone Company that they would refuse to enter into any contract with a local company where that local company was in competition with the Bell Company."

Judging from the context, the word "competition" as used in the judgment was equivalent to "duplication." In the course of the hearing, the following discussion took place:

> "Hon. Mr. MABEE: We have never had any doubt, Mr. Sylvan, about the absurdity of duplication of plants. It is not exactly competition.
>
> "A. It is not."

The word "competition" as used in the judgment appears to have been used in a descriptive, not in a definite, sense. The words "competing" and "non-competing" as describing telephone companies, are not words of legal precision. As the situation presents itself to me, they have been brought before the board as the result of the business practice of the Bell Company. They in reality are concerned with differentiating two sets of companies—companies with which the Bell Company has made agreements, and companies, with which it has not made agreements; and while the Bell Company may have made a distinction in practice based on the question of competition—no matter how it may have defined this word—it does not follow that this was the sole consideration on which this company would refuse to enter into an agreement. Certainly its discretion in this respect is not limited by statute.

The board is given power under subsections 5 and 6 of section 4 of the legislation of 1908, already cited, to order a company, subject to its jurisdiction, to afford to another company, whether subject to its jurisdiction or otherwise, the use of its long distance system upon such terms as to compensation as the board deems just and expedient. How the Bell Company may exercise its discretion in the matter of an agreement the board is not concerned, so far as these subsections are concerned, in advance of an application. The condition precedent to application being entertained and action taken by the board under these subsections is the inability of the applicant to arrive at an agreement, in respect of long distance connection, with the company owning, controlling or operating the long distance system.

The jurisdiction of the board is to make an order on terms, not to issue a declaratory order as to status.

Reported in 17 Can. Ry. Cas. 343. Concurred in by Assistant Chief Commissioner Scott and Commissioner Goodeve.

APPLICATION OF IMPERIAL OIL COMPANY, LIMITED, FOR AN ORDER DIRECTING REDUCTION IN FREIGHT ON PETROLEUM AND PETROLEUM PRODUCTS, IN CARLOADS, FROM VANCOUVER EAST TO ALBERTA POINTS.

Judgment, Chief Commissioner Drayton, April 7, 1915:

No case whatever has so far been made out for interference by the board. The situation as developed at the hearing shows that the applicants whole difficulties are the result of geographical situation and trade competition. The case is covered by Canadian Oil Case, reported in XII C.R.C. 350. The applicants have asked time to consider situation and effect of this authority.

No order will, therefore, issue, and no further action taken unless applicants again communicate with the board.

Concurred in by Deputy Chief Commissioner Nantel and Commissioner Goodeve.

APPLICATION OF S. A. HAMILTON COMPANY, LIMITED, OF MOOSEJAW, SASK., FOR SPUR TRACKAGE TO LOT 1-12, BLOCK 24, PRAIRIE HEIGHTS, SASK., ON THE LINE OF THE CANADIAN PACIFIC RAILWAY COMPANY, TO SERVE LUMBER AND COAL YARDS.

Judgment, Chief Commissioner Drayton, April 8, 1914:

This case was originally heard at Moosejaw on November 3 last when after discussion a direction was made that an order would go under section 226 of the Act. Engineering details before the board being insufficient, the matter was referred to Mr. Drury for inspection. He has since reported, and the railway company has been notified that the spur should be built in the manner directed.

The company has since submitted an agreement to the applicants which would cover the construction of the spur without the necessity of an order. The agreement is one quite satisfactory to the applicants except in so far as the following provision is concerned:

> "And will in like manner pay to the railway company all the costs and expenses which may be incurred by the railway company by reason of or arising out of any order or direction of the board heretofore or hereafter made in respect of or in any way affecting the said siding."

The applicants object to this clause.

I am of the opinion that the expenditures may be directed might possibly be of a character and for an object that would be entirely improper to make the applicants responsible for, and that the whole question should be left to the board; that is, not only the question as to work or practices which may in the future mean expenditure, but also the disposition of the resultant cost.

The spur may be built with clause now dealt with struck out, or under a formal order providing for the construction of the spur under section 226, the parties to be advised at once as to the disposition the board has made in this matter and make their election at an early date.

Commissioner McLean concurred.

Order issued authorizing construction of spur under section 226 of the Act.

THE CITY OF FORT WILLIAM *v.* C.P.R.

Judgment, Chief Commissioner Drayton, April 8, 1914.

Complaint has been made by the city of Fort William alleging that the Canadian Pacific Railway Company has taken up the tracks of the city's street railway where these tracks are crossed by an authorized spur to be constructed by the Canadian Pacific to the premises of the Starch Works, on Sixth street, Fort William.

It appears that the municipality and the railway company, entered into an agreement which is dated the 14th of December, 1908; that, under the terms of the agreement, a bridge is to be built sufficient not only for a railway but for street car and traffic purposes from Fort William across the Kaministiquia river, either to island No. 1 or No. 2, as the company selects. Apparently a bridge has been built to island No. 2, and the railway company is to provide the approaches for the street railway and vehicular traffic.

The city claims that the bridge which the company is bound to construct must be at the point where it laid its street car tracks which have been since interfered with. The company claims that the land in question is its land; while the city replies by stating that it is the only place where one of the necessary approaches can be made, and that the company is much in default in not having transferred the approach to the municipality. The company, on the other hand, says it cannot tell yet whether the approach will be there or not, and that no approach has yet been dedicated.

The case was heard last November. It is now quite time for the company to decide whether this is to be the approach or not.

The board has nothing to do with the specific performance of the agreement, and has not, as a matter of fact, anything before it to enable it to find where the approach should be or what it should consist of. Both parties seem either to have acted irregularly on the one hand or to be in default on the other. The city laid its track without leave on lands which apparently still belong to the railway company, and the company is admittedly in default regarding the highway approach which it agreed to provide and construct to the bridge.

The matter now seems to be one of dispute merely as to which will be senior—the C.P.R. spur track or the city street car rails. This is something which the board can deal with on the merits and apart altogether from any legal issues arising under the agreement; and, under the circumstances, my view is that neither party should be treated as senior, but that the necessary diamond where the tracks cross should be paid for equally. The matter really is trifling. There may be no necessity for protection, and the cost of the diamond will probably not exceed $200. In case the position of the approach has been defined by this time, the city should have the right to lay its track across the C.P.R. spur,—the cost to be divided equally between the parties.

Commissioner Mills concurred.

COMPLAINT OF THE TORONTO BOARD OF TRADE AND OF LEAK & COMPANY, LIMITED, OF TORONTO, COMPLAINING OF THE REFUSAL OF THE GRAND TRUNK RAILWAY COMPANY TO ACCEPT FROM THE CANADIAN NORTHERN ONTARIO RAILWAY COMPANY CARLOAD FREIGHT REQUIRING TEAM TRACK DELIVERY AT TORONTO.

RE GENERAL INTERSWITCHING ORDER OF THE BOARD.

Judgment, Chief Commissioner Drayton, April 8, 1914.

The Canadian Pacific and Grand Trunk Railway Companies were required by the board to show cause, at the sittings held on April 7, why the terms of the board's general interswitching order should not be extended to the use of team tracks.

This action was taken by the board as the result of the issuance of circular O.D.N.O. 954 of the Canadian Pacific addressed to agents and shippers as follows:—

> "It has been the practice in the past in Toronto, and then only in some instances, to switch cars from connecting lines for team track delivery. Effective April 1, this practice will be discontinued. This does not affect the switching of cars to private sidings under the terms of our tariff N.O.E. 262."

The whole question of interswitching and local switching has been at loose ends for a long time. The board's general interswitching order was made on July 8, 1908, the order being made by the board as composed of the late chief commissioner, the Honourable Mr. Mabee, Honourable Mr. Bernier, and Commissioner Mills. Prior to the issuance of this order, railway companies at certain points were interswitching as a matter of agreement and perhaps mutual accommodation, and as a matter of board direction at London, Lindsay, New Westminster and Rossland.

It is claimed by the shippers that at first the railway companies construed the order as covering movements not only to private sidings, but also to team tracks, and

probably for this reason the Canadian Pacific made its application to the board to re-open the London interswitching case. This application was heard at Toronto, January, 1909, and was for an order rescinding the London order fixing the rate to be charged for the interchange of traffic and the interswitching of cars over the branch line of the Grand Trunk Railway Company of Canada, and connecting the lines of the Grand Trunk Railway Company and the Canadian Pacific Railway Company at London.

The Honourable Mr. MABEE in his judgment, delivered November 27, 1911, states:—

> "The ground upon which the application is based is that, on July 8, 1908, effective September 1, 1908, the board by its general interswitching order established certain tolls for interswitching generally within certain limits. The tolls that would be payable by the Canadian Pacific Railway Company to the Grand Trunk Railway Company for interswitching at London would be less under the general order than those payable under the special order of July 25, 1905.
>
> "It may as well be said at the outset that, when the investigation was being held that led up to the making of the general order, the London situation was not present to my mind, and it was not intended that the order covering interswitching there should be interfered with by the general order. The companies have so regarded the matter. Hence this application for rescission of the London order, which would leave the general order applicable."

The application was refused on the ground that the Canadian Pacific, under the London order, enjoyed rights greater than those given by the general order, and the London order placed at the disposal of the Canadian Pacific Railway Company every track of the Grand Trunk Railway Company in London except shed tracks. The distinction of facilities covered as between one order and the other consists of team tracks. In the opinion, therefore, of the late chief commissioner, the general order did not include team tracks. This judgment was concurred in by Commissioner Mills, who was also a party to the making of the original order.

A further ruling was made on the 3rd of February, 1912, to the effect that the interswitching order deals only with the tolls payable, and was never intended to compel one railway to turn over its entire terminals to another or others. Notwithstanding the rulings of the past, the railway companies, as evidenced by the circular issued by the Canadian Pacific and already referred to, have at least in part carried on interswitching so as to include team track deliveries. There is no doubt that team tracks do constitute, as has in the past been found by the board, terminals of the respective companies, and it well may be that the commission should not enable one company to carry on its business by the use of the terminals of another, and that, if such a principle was adhered to, general business would suffer largely, as no company would be able to get the slightest advantage in putting in expensive modern terminals giving the shippers an advanced or accelerated service, if their facilities could be made use of by any other company.

The question is too large a question, in view of the considered judgments of the board, to deal with at the present time.

The companies have been directed to furnish the board with such information as to cost of movement and the effect of an order which would include team tracks as well as private sidings.

Notwithstanding this position, I am of the view that the circular issued by the Canadian Pacific is not effective. The Canadian Pacific has issued its tariff No. E-2646 applying to lines Fort William, Ont., and east thereof. It is a special freight tariff covering local switching, interswitching, and absorption of switching charges on carload traffic, and applying to and from stations therein mentioned,

including, among many others, Toronto. The tariff states that traffic forwarded under switching rates as published therein will not be handled through company's warehouses or freight sheds, but must be taken delivery of direct from cars on private sidings or public team tracks. This notation is on the face of the tariff, and as interswitching traffic is carried at switching rates just as truly as local switching is, covers the movement in both cases. Section 1 deals with the scale of local switching charges, and section 2 with interswitching charges at junction points. In neither case are team tracks excluded.

In my view, therefore, a switching movement is provided for by tariff properly issued and filed. The companies cannot, under the terms of the Act, decline traffic properly offered to them under these tariffs and within the terms of the tariffs, as I hold team tracks to be, until proper notice of cancellation has been given. As the cancellation of these tariffs will mean that the traffic will move at higher tolls, the result is that the cancellation cannot be effective until 30 days after its publication.

Assistant Chief Commissioner Scott and Mr. Commissioner McLean concurred.

Order issued declaring that the Grand Trunk Railway Company's Tariff, C.R.C. No. 2457 applied to and included the traffic ordered to it by the Canadian Northern Ontario Railway Company for delivery on team tracks at Toronto; and directing the Grand Trunk Railway Company to accept forthwith carload traffic offered by the Canadian Northern Ontario Railway Company for team track delivery at Toronto.

SUBWAY CARRYING HIGHWAY WHICH IS THE NORTHWEST BOUNDARY OF THE TOWN OF STREETSVILLE UNDER THE TRACKS OF THE CANADIAN PACIFIC RAILWAY.

Judgment, Assistant Chief Commissioner Scott, April 14, 1914:

For many years the Canadian Pacific Railway Company has had a single track crossing on the level over the highway between lots 5 and 6 in the 5th concession west, township of Toronto. The highway is partly in the village of Streetsville, and partly in the township of Toronto. It is the northwest boundary of the village. In connection with its double tracking of its London branch, the railway company applied to the board for approval of a second track over a number of highways in the village of Streetsville. By Order No. 20079, of the 15th of August last, the construction of a second track over the said highways was approved by the board, on consent of the municipality. It was understood, however, that the municipality desired a separation of grades on the highway now under consideration. After the hearing in Toronto on January 26 last, the board sent one of its engineers, Mr. Belanger, to report on the feasibility of a subway at this highway crossing. In his report, dated February 21, Mr. Belanger says that the highway lends itself to the construction of a subway, and he recommends that one be constructed. Mr. Belanger further points out that the crossing is a dangerous one, and that the traffic on both the highway and the railway is fairly heavy.

In a letter to the board from Mr. E. W. Beatty, the railway company's general counsel, dated the 18th December last, he says:

> "A count of traffic over this crossing for 24 hours commencing 7 a.m., December 9, shows the following result: 81 vehicles, 20 pedestrians, 80 trains and 33 switch movements, and for 24 hours commencing 7 a.m., December 10, 115 vehicles, 14 pedestrians, 57 trains and 11 switch movements."

This highway is but a few feet away from the junction of the main line tracks of the London sub-division of the company and its Teeswater branch, and all movements from both lines in a southeasterly direction must pass over this highway. The last plan furnished the board by the railway company, shows four tracks over the said highway.

It seems to me, under these circumstances, that this is a place where the board should order a separation of grades. The subway should furnish the statutory head-

way of 14 feet, with a clear span of 20 feet over the crown of the highway. The subway should be on a line with the highway, so that there will be a clear view through it from the highway at each end. The necessity for this subway is mostly due to the heavy traffic on the railway, as evidenced by the number of trains which, according to Mr. Beatty's letter, pass in 24 hours, and to the desire of the company to maintain four tracks across the highway.

Although the village of Streetsville is a separate municipality, it is not yet in a position to contribute much towards work of this kind. I am advised that the population of Streetsville is about 585; and its assessed value is only $300,500; but it seems to me that the elimination of the danger of accident at this highway crossing will be a material benefit to the inhabitants of both Streetsville and the township.

Under all the above circumstances, I think that a fair division of the cost of this subway would be 20 per cent, not exceeding $5,000, out of The Railway Grade Crossing Fund; and the remainder paid as follows:

> Five per cent by the village of Streetsville, 15 per cent by the township of Toronto, 80 per cent by the railway company.

The surface of the road through the subway should be maintained by the municipal authorities responsible for the highways; all other cost of maintenance should be borne by the railway company. Detailed plans of the proposed structure should be submitted by the railway company for the approval of an engineer of the board, within thirty days; and the subway should be completed by the 1st September next.

The municipal authorities affected are doubtless aware that there is a provision in the Ontario Municipal Act which permits them to pay their share of any work ordered by the board by the issue of debentures for a long term of years, and that the issuance of such debentures need not be specially authorized by an Act of the legislature or by vote of the ratepayers of the municipality affected.

Commissioner Mills concurred.

COMPLAINT REGARDING RAILWAY SERVICE RENDERED BY THE QUEBEC ORIENTAL RAILWAY COMPANY BETWEEN MATAPEDIA AND GASPÉ, QUE.

Judgment, Mr. Commissioner McLean, April 15, 1914:

A number of complaints have been received concerning the train service between Matapedia and Gaspé. These complaints set out in very emphatic language that the service rendered is indifferent and extremely unsatisfactory. Complaints have been received not only as set out in the statements of individuals, but also in the form of resolutions from different municipalities. These complaints emphasize an unsatisfactory passenger service during the winter season; and it is stated that not only is the passenger service unsatisfactory, but that there is also a very inadequate method of handling the mails.

The matter was before the board during the winter of 1913, when the Atlantic, Quebec and Western Railway was in its first season of operation under the new management. It was found on investigation by the board's officers that the service was unsatisfactory on account of delays existing and directions were made which it was considered would improve the situation. Complaints were again filed this year in regard to the interruption of the service during the winter season. Those complaints were directed more especially against the service on the portion of the railway system known as the Quebec Oriental Railway. The investigations of the board's officers which have just been made show that a very unsatisfactory condition in regard to service exists.

The complaint is directed against the Quebec Oriental Railway Company. In strictness, there are two railways concerned—the Quebec Oriental, operating between Matapedia and New Carlisle, a distance of 100 miles, and the Atlantic, Quebec and Western Railway, operating between New Carlisle and Gaspé, a distance of 104

miles. These roads are controlled by the same interests and are under common management.

An analysis of the operation of these roads for the year ending June 30, 1913, shows that they are in a very unsatisfactory state financially. The Quebec Oriental has a share capital of $500,000 of common stock in $100 shares. Of this, $117,000 are outstanding, the balance being in the treasury. On the amount outstanding, it is stated there was realized a sum equal to about 13 per cent of the par. It is not stated in the report to the Government whether the balance was issued for construction purposes or otherwise. No dividends were paid on this stock during the year. There are outstanding $974,000 of 5 per cent first mortgage gold bonds, and a similar amount of 5 per cent second mortgage gold bonds. In addition, there are included under miscellaneous obligations, $27,843 of obligations carrying interest at 5 per cent. The latter item is concerned with an obligation incurred for repairs and renewals on rolling stock. The total interest on the bonded debt of this railway was $98,379.45. The bonded debt per mile is $19,578, or an interest charge per mile of $978.90.

The Atlantic, Quebec and Western Railway has a share capital of $5,000,000 of common stock, in $100 shares. Of this, $2,000,000 are outstanding, the balance being in the treasury. It is stated in the Government report that $500,000 was issued for cash, and the balance was issued for construction. There are $2,548,675 of 5 per cent bonds outstanding. This represents a bonded indebtedness of $24,389 per mile, on which the interest charge per mile is $1,219. No dividend was paid on the stock during the year.

The Quebec Oriental shows in its sworn report to the Government, already referred to, an expenditure of $26,631.43 for maintenance of way and structures. In addition, there was incurred for special repairs and betterments the following expenditures:—

(6)	Bridges, trestles and culverts	$ 2,086 59
(7)	New ties (42,568)	17,218 98
(11)	Ballast	2,296 87
(14)	Fencing and right of way	276 00
(18)	Station buildings and fixtures	886 80
		$22,765 24

The above expenditure was carried out by the manager on behalf of the Quebec Oriental Railway Company during the year ending June 30, 1913; and he was given to secure this a mortgage on the rolling stock and other property of the company. This arrangement was ratified by the London board.

An analysis of the operating expenditures of the two railways for the year in question gives the following result:—

	Maintenance of way and Structures.	Maintenance of Equipment.	Transportation Expenses.	General Expenses.
Quebec Oriental	$24,631 43	$12,768 61	$51,368 59	$ 5,602 28
Atl., Que. & Western	29,876 56	7,015 42	39,656 96	13,882 07

Putting this in a summary way, the operating expenses of the Atlantic, Quebec and Western were $904 per mile, while the gross earnings were $401. In the case of the Quebec Oriental, the operating expenses were $943 per mile, while the gross earnings were $1,017.

Putting the details as to income and expenditure in a condensed form, the following results are available for the two railways for the year in question, from the sworn returns to the Dominion Government:—

Quebec Oriental Railway Company.

Freight revenue		$ 52,571 66
Passenger train revenue—		
Passenger revenue	$43,752 63	
Mail revenue	3,560 40	
Express revenue	1,662 14	
Other passenger train revenue	102 25	
		49,077 42
Revenue from operations other than transportation—		
Storage—freight		17 50
" baggage		21 00
Total operating revenue		$101,687 58
Deduction from gross corporate income—		
Operating expense (ratio 92·8)		94,370 91
Net operating revenue		$ 7,316 67
Other deductions—		
Other rents (as set out on p. 41)		5,969 90
Interest accrued on funded debt (as set out on p. 27)		98,379 45
Total deductions from gross corporate income		$104,349 35
Net operating revenue		7,316 67
Net corporate loss		$ 97,032 68

Atlantic, Quebec and Western Railway Company.

Freight revenue		$ 17,859 82
Passenger service train revenue—		
Passenger revenue	$23,480 38	
Excess baggage	60 31	
Express revenue	468 80	
		24,009 49
Revenue from operations other than transportation—		
Storage—freight		37 66
Total operating revenue		$ 41,906 97
Deductions from gross corporate income—		
Operating expenses (ratio 215·78)		90,431 01
Net operating deficit		$ 48,524 04
Other deductions—		
Other rents (as set out on p. 41)		$ 1,244 46
Interest accrued on funded debt (no item shown)		
Net corporate loss		$ 49,768 50
While no deduction for interest is made on p. 41 of the report, it appears from p. 27 that there was paid on funded debt during the year		127,433 75
Adding this to the loss already set out, there is a net corporate loss of		177,202 25

The unsatisfactory financial position disclosed by what has been above set out is further emphasized by the correspondence with the board has received in connection with this complaint and other complaints connected with the railways in question. For example, during the month of January, 1913, the gross receipts of the Atlantic, Quebec & Western were $3,449.65, while the expenses of the same road during the same period were $8,744.90. When the month of February of the same year is added, the result is that the gross receipts for freight and passengers were $5,354, while the expenditures were $19,042.

The Board has had a number of complaints regarding the condition of the right of way, the fences, gates, and crossings along the Quebec Oriental Railway. The

matter had been gone into by the Board's engineers, and instructions have been given as to the improvements to be made. The directions given required the improvements to be made by the end of December, 1913; but the Board, on subsequent representation, being fully satisfied that the financial condition of the world's money market rendered it extremely difficult to raise money, decided that it was only reasonable that an extension should be given to the end of December, 1914. As illustrating the financial side of the matter, reference may be made to various letters on file. The board had, in the first instance, not issued a formal order in regard to the improvements to be made in the road-bed, considering that a formal order would not be necessary. It was, however, asked by the president of the Quebec Oriental Railway Company to issue a formal order. In a letter dated June 23, 1913, from the London office, in which this request was contained, the president used the following language:

> "The commisioners are aware of the great difficulty at the present time in raising money on any security whatever, and it may be advisable, as suggested by you, a more formal order should be made on the company, so as to place it beyond argument that the works come within the definition in the Railway Act of 'Working expenses', which as you are aware rank in priority to all outstanding mortgages, bonds, or other securities."

The letter continued—

> "We are very anxious to make arrangements to raise the necessary capital to enable us to repair the line."

The Board has on its files an undertaking from the general manager of the company that the work directed in connection with the road-bed which has already been referred to, would be commenced the first thing in the spring of 1914.

While the railway should give as good a service as possible to those using its line, it may as well be frankly recognized that in view of the extremely unsatisfactory shape the railways concerned are in from the standpoint of earnings, it would be worse than useless to issue additional orders looking to increased expenditures. The Board cannot by the issuance of an order create satisfactory credit conditions for a road whose finances are in unsatisfactory shape. The basis of a road's credit is to be found in the satisfactory condition of its earnings. Those resident along the line of the railways find the service unsatisfactory. There is no question that their grievances are in many cases well-founded; but, under the circumstances disclosed, it would not only be unreasonable but useless for the Board to make any order calling for the raising of any considerable amount of capital to be expended upon improving the service. Various directions have been given regarding the improvement of the road, and constant supervision will be exercised by the Board to see that the promises made by the railway will be implemented by action.

The Board is fully seized of the grievances complained of and impressed with their seriousness. There is no necessity of having a hearing which would simply mean a cumulation of examples of the grievances already before the Board. What is needed is not more evidence as to grievances, but a remedy for them. It may as well be frankly recognized that an order of the board cannot create capital. Whether capital can be obtained depends upon the resources of the applicant. All that can be done in the present case, in addition to what has already been directed, is to deal with the improvement of the method on which the service is being conducted. The situation is just this: there are two roads which are not making expenses, and all that can be obtained is to do the best possible with the service at present rendered. The alternative is less service.

The investigation of the conditions existing in connection with the train service during the past winter shows that the railway has had very severe climatic conditions to grapple with. There are available for use on the two lines five snow ploughs. Of these, three are wedge ploughs, one is a wing plough, while the other is a Russell wing

plough. This is a new plough and represents the very latest type of wing plough. It appears, however, from the nature of the country between Newport and Gaspe, and the heavy snow to be encountered, nothing short of a rotary snow plough would be sufficient to handle the heavy snow that has visited this section during the past year. A rotary would cost about five times as much as a wing plough, while its operation would be about twice as expensive as that of a wing plough. One difficulty in the way of service has been that the railway has not got its trains into service sufficiently quickly after the road has been cleared. There have been cases where the line was blocked by derailments, bad weather conditions, etc., between New Carlisle and Matapedia, and where the company failed to run the service between New Carlisle and Gaspe, although there was nothing in this section to interfere with traffic. On the other hand, when the line has been blocked and otherwise disabled between New Carlisle and Gaspe, the service has been continued between New Carlisle and Matapedia. The people west of New Carlisle complain of the interrupted mail service.

It appears that one difficulty with the operation of trains has been a laxity of discipline on the part of the employees. There has been delay in connection with the starting and moving of trains on time, and there has also been a lack of attention in regard to notifying people of the trains being delayed. Instructions have been issued by the railway to see that the requirements of the Railway Act in this respect are thoroughly lived up to.

The question of locomotive power is one which has attracted much attention. The Quebec Oriental has been using an engine which was borrowed from the Intercolonial. The railway has just purchased a locomotive from St. Louis, and this will be on the line at work very shortly. There are at present two locomotives in the shops being repaired; one of these will be out about the 1st of May, and the other, it is expected, will be out about the middle of May. There are two other engines in the shops at present. With the new engine, there will be nine engines available for service on both railways. This will be sufficient to move the traffic.

About 30,000 ties have been purchased for renewals during the present year, and the manager of the road is waiting for a further supply of money from England to carry on repairs on the line.

What can be done at present is concerned entirely with an improvement in the service. What is desired by the people is regular operation of the trains. They have shown a very reasonable attitude in this respect. The mayor of Gaspe states that the people in his locality are willing, if the railway finds it impossible to run a daily train and keep it going satisfactorily, to accept a tri-weekly service, so long as this service runs regularly on time so that they can depend on it, not only as regards mail and express, but passenger and freight as well.

Part of the dilatoriness in connection with the train service appears to be a lack of discipline among the employees. The trains have been run by them in an easy-going way. The railway should, therefore, take steps to so stiffen up the discipline and improve the operation of the trains that the passenger service be carried on regularly, making connections as outlined in the timetables, so long as the line is not interrupted by storms or other obstructions. Where there is interruption by storms or other obstructions, the railway not so affected should run its service regularly on time, carrying mail and all traffic to the end of its own line; that is to say, if the service on the Quebec Oriental is interfered with, the service on the Atlantic, Quebec and Western should be carried on, notwithstanding this interference. The same to apply if the interference is on the Atlantic, Quebec and Western Railway. Full notice in regard to train delays should be posted and given to the public.

A reasonable time will be allowed by the Board for improvements in the respects outlined, and thereafter a further inspection will be made.

Chief Commissioner Drayton, Assistant Chief Commissioner Scott, and Commissioner Goodeve, concurred.

SESSIONAL PAPER No. 20c

APPLICATION OF THE C.L.O. & W. RAILWAY CO., FOR AUTHORITY TO TAKE CERTAIN LANDS, BEING PARTS OF LOTS 185, 184, AND 178, IN THE TOWN OF BOWMANVILLE, ONTARIO, FOR THE PURPOSE OF CONSTRUCTING A FREIGHT YARD AND APPROACHES THERETO TO SECURE THE CONVENIENT ACCOMMODATION OF THE TRAFFIC UPON ITS RAILWAY AT THE TOWN OF BOWMANVILLE, ONT.

Judgment, Mr. Commissioner Goodeve, April 16, 1914:

This application was heard on March 9, 1914, before the Assistant Chief Commissioner, Commissioner McLean and myself, after a thorough examination of the situation on the ground accompanied by the mayor, and some members of the council, together with Mr. McLean who appeared as legal counsel on behalf of the city, school board, board of trade, and St. Paul's Presbyterian church, and certain citizens whose lands were not to be taken, but who claimed they would be injuriously affected; also representatives of the railway company.

There are on file three petitions: One in favour of the application as applied for by the railway company, stating that in the opinion of the signers it is the best available location for the purposes of the said freight yards, and will give the best facilities for the business and shipping community of the town of Bowmanville, and that it will cause less injury to private rights than any other location which could be obtained. This petition is largely signed by the owners of manufacturing industries and the business men generally. There is a second petition opposing the application on the ground that it would injure one of the best residential sections of the town. This petition is signed by property holders interested. And there is a third petition also opposing the application upon the ground that it would injure the property and interfere with the services of St. Paul's Presbyterian Church. This petition is signed by members and adherents of the said church.

At the hearing two other plans were suggested by those who were opposed to the application of the C.L.O. & W. Railway Co., both of which were north of the main line, one, marked "A" in red on the plan, being taken off at a point where the main line crosses Concession street and running northwesterly. In connection with this plan two options were filed with the board covering properties that it would be necessary to acquire, one for $5,500 and the other for $5,000 and an option for the balance of the property that would be required at a price of $900 per acre. The second plan, marked "B" in red on the map, being taken off at the same point as that proposed in the application of the railway company, only on the north side of the main line and running northeasterly. In this latter it was stated it would not be necessary to secure the two houses above referred to, so that all the necessary property could be obtained at a price of $900 per acre.

The railway company, through Mr. Leonard and its counsel, Mr. MacMurchy, oppose both these plans as being unsuitable for the purposes of the company, claiming that they could not get a suitable grade; that, in the case of the plan marked "B," it would involve an additional interlocking plant in connection with the Toronto and Eastern Railway Co., with added cost and inconvenience in operation. That the distance from the centre of the shipping district for the round trip would be one-half mile greater than at the proposed location, and would involve the crossing of the main line at the interlocker at the junction of Scugog and Wellington streets in the cartage of all freight to and from the freight sheds; that the company had spent in the neighbourhood of from $250,000 to $300,000 to acquire a good location in order that it might serve the public satisfactorily in handling traffic to and from the railway, and that a large portion of the value of this would be destroyed if they were compelled to go so far from the business centre.

With regard to the petition on behalf of St. Paul's Presbyterian Church, it was pointed out that under the Lord's Day Observance Act no freight trains would be allowed to be made up on Sunday, and that switching was not likely to take place

during the time at which services were being held. Mr. MacMurchy, on behalf of the C.L.O. & W. at page 640, vol. 196, states as follows:—

> "This is a local freight yard. There is no work done here on Sundays . . . It will not be necessary in Mr. Leonard's judgment to have a shunt more than twice a day, probably one shunt in the morning and one shunt at night."

This latter of course refers to week days. Again at page 641 Mr. MacMurchy points out that in Toronto St. Andrew's Church is 66 feet away from the local freight yard in that city, while this property will be 160 feet away; and, referring to the objection that it would disturb the pupils of the High School, as above pointed out, under ordinary conditions they would never hear the shunting, as it would be done twice daily, in the morning and the evening.

With reference to the third petition, signed by those property owners, no portion of whose property would be taken by the railway company, but who claim their property would be depreciated by the locating of the freight sheds at the point applied for. The board has weighed carefully all the representations made on their behalf. The property of most of these complainants is situated on the east side of Wellington street. It is to be noted that the municipality by by-law granted the use of Wellington street to the Toronto and Eastern Railway Company for railway purposes, and that the tracks on this street will be made use of for the moving of freight cars to and from the business centre. It is true that the moving of freight cars by electric power is not as objectionable as by steam, as there would be no smoke and less noise. It was also represented to the board by some witnesses that at the time the by-law was passed the citizens were not aware that these tracks would be used for freight purposes. However that may be, this district is now established as a railroad centre.

To allow the Toronto and Eastern Railway Company to enter the centre of the shipping district by means of this street, while compelling the C.L.O. & W. to establish its freight yards on the outer limits of the city, would be giving to the former and rival company a decided advantage, and which, as pointed out by Mr. Leonard, would to that extent destroy the value of the large expenditure made by his company in order to secure a central location.

We have on file, submitted by the city, a statement showing the amount of traffic crossing the diamond of the C.L.O. & W. and the Toronto & Eastern Railway Company's tracks on Scugog and Wellington streets, and it would undoubtedly be an added source of danger to compel all the teaming of freight to cross the railway tracks twice at this point. Further, I think the bona fide of the C.L.O. & W. Railway Co., is clearly shown by its willingness to expend a very much larger sum to acquire this location than would be necessary to acquire either of the alternative locations.

The board's chief engineer, under date of March 13, 1914, after a careful survey of the whole situation, in a report submitted to the Board, reached the following conclusion:

> "In my opinion the layout as proposed by the railway company is in the best interests of the town as a whole, and of the railway company."

Undoubtedly, for residential purposes, some of the residences on the east side of Wellington street will be depreciated, and the board regrets that under the Railway Act it has no power to grant compensation under the conditions as here exist. Further, it may be pointed out that it almost invariably happens in the entering of a railway into any growing municipality, individuals suffer loss or damage. Recognizing this the law has made provision to cover it as far as possible, but it cannot be done in all cases; therefore following the usual practice the right of the individual must give way to the general advantage of the public as a whole.

Therefore, in view of the report of the chief engineer of the board, and after a careful consideration of all the circumstances, I am of the opinion that the application

of the railway company should be granted, upon the conditions that no unnecessary whistling, ringing of bells, or letting off of steam, that no shunting during the hours of service in St. Paul's Presbyterian church be allowed within the yard, that no live stock be loaded from this yard, and that the yard shall be neatly fenced and fence painted.

Assistant Chief Commissioner Scott and Commissioner McLean concurred.

Ordered accordingly.

COMPLAINT OF THE MILTON PRESSED BRICK COMPANY, LIMITED, OF MILTON, ONTARIO, AGAINST THE ACTION OF THE CANADIAN PACIFIC RAILWAY COMPANY IN HOLDING UP THE CONSTRUCTION WORK ON THEIR DOUBLE TRACKING BETWEEN TORONTO AND GUELPH JUNCTION, ONTARIO.

Oral judgment delivered by Chief Commissioner Drayton at the close of the hearing, April 24, 1914:

The trouble in this case seems to have arisen from a misunderstanding or may be spoken of as the result of leaving important matters absolutely at loose ends.

So far as the facts are concerned, I find that Mr. McCannell believed that the railway right-of-way would be thrown to the north a distance of at least thirty feet: and that, on the strength of what he believed to be the understanding—his belief being grounded on a certain plan which the company submitted and on work which went on for some two or three days—he spent $34,000 in improving his property at that point. —an expenditure which he would not have made had he known that the company would not have given him the thirty feet mentioned by Mr. Lumsden.

It must be borne in mind, however, that the rights of the complainant are individual rights; they are spoken of, not only in the written application, but in the evidence given before the Board, as a matter of individual rights, involving questions which arise under contract, or are based on estoppel; and nothing involving public interest under the Railway Act, such as would justify an order of the board, appears to have been said or done. Hence the board has no jurisdiction to act either on the ground of contract or estoppel. If it can be shown that a contract was really or virtually made or if the statements and conduct of the company are such as to warrant an action for damages—and on this I express no opinion—it is a matter for the appropriate court to deal with. It is undoubtedly in the interest of one of the industries located on the line of the Canadian Pacific Railway, that the main line of that company should be moved north at that point; but, under no possible circumstances, as it seems to me, would the Board, apart from some public necessity, be justified in interfering with the through tracks and the rights of property of the railway company.

For these reasons, the application must be dismissed.

PROTECTION AT 18TH STREET, LACHINE, QUE.

Judgment, Mr. Commissioner McLean, January 2, 1914:

In the answer of the Grand Trunk on file, under date of June 7, 1913, it is submitted that 18th avenue (or 18th street) is not a legally constituted street crossing right of way and lands and tracks of the railway company, and that no order has been issued by the Board converting said crossing into a regular public crossing. The city in its reply dated July 2, 1913, refers to deed of sale by W. McDonald to the Montreal and Lachine Railroad Company, said deed of sale being executed on the 7th of March, 1848. This deed of sale is concerned with the sale of certain lands by the vendor to the Montreal and Lachine Railroad Company, the predecessor in title of the Grand Trunk Railway, in which it was agreed between the vendor and the buyer that Market street should be carried across the railway as a public street, as set out on the plan referred to in the deed of sale. It is represented by the city of Lachine

that Market street is now 18th avenue. This contention of the city as to the seniority of Market street was not controverted in evidence by the Grand Trunk. The city also refers to the Board's Order No. 9616 of February 7, 1910, which provided for the installation of an electric bell at the crossing in question, as a further evidence of the legality of the crossing.

It would appear that the creation of the street crossing in question was at least contemporaneous with the acquisition of the land for the right of way of the Montreal and Lachine Railway, and I am of the opinion that the rights of the city are at least equal to those of the railway.

It is admitted in a communication of Mr. Bowker, general superintendent, that gates are necessary at this crossing, and the reports of the Board's inspector in regard to the traffic and use of this crossing substantiate this position.

The only question then is as to the distribution of cost. The city submits that the same rule should be applied in the distribution of cost as in the case of Order 9616 already referred to. In the Order in question, the cost of the electric bell less 20 per cent of the cost of installation from the Grade Crossing Fund was placed upon the railway. In support of this contention, the city claims that the crossing is rendered more dangerous by the fact that the railway is running some of its trains "at that spot at a much higher speed than the ordinary rate of speed prescribed by the Railway Act." The Board in directing railways to install electric bells has, since The Railway Grade Crossing Fund has been available, followed the practice of putting the whole of the cost, less the 20 per cent contribution from the Fund, on the railway. The practice in regard to electric bells has no necessary bearing upon what is proper in connection with the question of installation of gates.

This is a case in which a contribution from the Grade Crossing Fund would be proper. It is, however, a question as to whether the board has not by directing a contribution to the cost of installation of an electric bell exhausted its powers under the Railway Act. The matter is at present before the Department of Justice for a ruling. If the Department of Justice rules that it is within the power of the Board, under the Railway Act, to make a contribution to the cost of gates, then I am of opinion that the cost of installation should be divided as follows: 20 per cent out of the Grade Crossing Fund, 55 per cent by the railway and 25 per cent by the city; the cost of maintenance and operation to be divided 70 per cent on the railway, and 30 per cent on the municipality.

In the event of its being ruled that the Board has exhausted its powers to aid this crossing, then the cost of installation should be divided 65 per cent upon the railway and 35 per cent on the municipality.

It is not feasible to have the work of installation of gates now gone on with. As soon as the ruling from the Department of Justice is received, Order may issue: the Order to set out in its terms the time within which the plans are to be furnished and the work completed.

Judgment, Mr. Commissioner McLean, April 28, 1914:

The Department of Justice now having ruled that—"notwithstanding that a grant has already been made out of The Railway Grade Crossing Fund for the protection of the crossing of 18th street, Lachine, it is open to the Board to make a further allowance, the previous grant having been made more than a year ago, and the total grant including that now proposed to be made not exceeding the sum of $5,000," order for gates, with the distribution of cost as between the Fund, the railway and the municipality on the terms already indicated, should go.

Chief Commissioner Drayton concurred.

Order, in accordance with judgment, issued.

SESSIONAL PAPER No. 20c

APPLICATION OF THE TOWNSHIP OF HUMBERSTONE FOR AN ORDER, UNDER SECTION 250 OF THE RAILWAY ACT, DIRECTING THE GRAND TRUNK RAILWAY COMPANY TO PROVIDE AND CONSTRUCT SUITABLE CULVERTS UNDER ITS LINE OF RAILWAY KNOWN AS THE BUFFALO AND GODERICH DIVISION OF THE GRAND TRUNK, ON LOTS 22 AND 23, FIRST CONCESSION, TOWNSHIP OF HUMBERSTONE.

Judgment, Chief Commissioner Drayton, April 29, 1914:

The material in support of the application declared that the culverts were necessary for the purpose of properly draining farm lands lying on the north of the railway track, and for carrying the water from drains that were being constructed by the township under the provisions of the Municipal Drainage Act.

The application was opposed by the railway company and the issue set down for hearing at Toronto on November 6, 1912.

It was shown at the hearing that the township had properly passed a by-law, under the Appropriation Act, providing for its drainage works; and that, as part of the cost of the undertaking, was included $1,600 for the purpose of building the culverts under the railway. The by-law also includes the assessment to be made for the improvements to the drain. Under this assessment, the special rate to be paid by the Grand Trunk is shown to amount to some $86.46, payable in ten annual installments.

Apparently a proper notice of a court of revision to be held for the purpose of considering complaints and appeals against the scheme of assessment was given, and the by-law was finally passed on July 31, 1911.

The acts of the municipality were all intra vires, and the assessment has become binding.

Under these circumstances, the only matter open to the board was to pass upon the character of the work on the railway property having regard to its sufficiency for railway operation and the safety of the travelling public.

It, however, developed at the hearing that the railway, which had been built some fifty years ago, at the point in question had provided wooden culverts—two at this point each being six feet square on the inside, and that the openings had been filled and thirty inch pipes substituted.

The claim advanced by the municipality was disputed by the railway company; and the matter was referred to the board's chief engineer with instructions to arrive at the exact facts after making a personal inspection on the ground. His report sustains the claim advanced by the municipality, the change having been made by the company so as to make permanent what was originally only a wooden structure. The change nevertheless lessened the waterway and interfered with natural drainage across the railway. The engineer, however, reports that the old wooden box culverts as constructed and located, would not serve the present scheme of drainage proposed by the township engineer. The new culverts, therefore, in any instance would be necessary.

The construction was approved at the former sitting, and before the engineer's report was received, the question of cost being reserved. The work has been completed at a cost of $2,191.09. This cost the engineer reports is fair and reasonable. The work has been done by the railway company. Ordinarily the board does not interfere at all with an assessment made under an appropriate local Act. My own view is that it has no jurisdiction to do so. There are, however, some special circumstances in this case. The railway company without any apparent right did interfere with surface drainage, and on the complaint of the municipality would have been directed to restore the former culverts at a cost, as the engineer reports, of some $250 each.

The board's engineer reports on this basis that a balance should be paid by the municipality of $1,691.09, in view of the unauthorized act of the company in diminishing surface drainage, and in view of the very reasonable assessment that has been made against it for the cost of the work. In my view, this amount should be further

reduced to the sum of $1,600, which is the original estimate and on which the plan of assessment has been based.

Concurred in by Assistant Chief Commissioner Scott.

Reported in 17 Can. Ry. Cas. 316.

APPLICATION MADE BY THE ESSEX TERMINAL RAILWAY COMPANY OBJECTING TO THE REMOVAL OF THAT COMPANY AS A PARTICIPATING CARRIER IN TARIFFS AND SUPPLEMENTS APPLICABLE TO INTERNATIONAL TRAFFIC.

Judgment, Chief Commissioner Drayton, May 4, 1914:

The application is made as the result of notices the applicant company has received in the form of amendments to schedules of the Michigan Central, Grand Trunk, Wabash, and Pere Marquette companies making the Essex Terminal party to the application of Windsor rates to and from points on its line, these amendments withdrawing the Essex Terminal as a concurring party to those schedules in so far as they apply to joint traffic to and from the United States.

Following the usual practice of the Board, such tariffs and supplements were suspended pending a hearing. The hearing subsequently took place at Ottawa on April 21st, 1914.

At the hearing the line companies' action was justified by them as a result of the order of the Interstate Commerce Commission in the Industrial Railways Case No. 4181.

The applicant company showed that its status had not been passed upon either directly or indirectly before the Interstate Commerce Commission. This was admitted by the railway companies issuing the suspended tariffs. The position of such companies may be shown by reference to the statement of Mr. Martin (who appeared for the Grand Trunk Railway Company), as follows:

> "Mr. Chairman, I may just state that the Essex Terminal Railway was classed, after this opinion was given out by the Interstate Commerce Commission, as one of the roads partially owned or controlled by the industries which it served; that, of course, possibly has not been determined as a fact yet, but action was taken in order to be on the safe side, to be in line with the request of the various roads with whom the Canadian roads interchange traffic in the States. The action was taken in connection with the Grand Trunk in only four tariffs, I think, which have international application; no action was taken whatever on Canadian traffic. Our tariffs on Canadian traffic apply to-day to the Essex Terminal just the same as they did previously to the opinion expressed by the Interstate Commerce Commission.
>
> "We are in this position, whatever our view may be, or whatever the decision finally may be in connection with the Essex Terminal Railway, that our connections in the States, with whom we have concurrent tariffs and through rates, requested us to take this action.
>
> "This is merely a statement of the facts, Mr. Chairman, and we are not seeking at this time to determine the ownership or interests of the Essex Terminal Railway; but that feature was brought out and the action was taken so that there would be no conflict with the opinion expressed by the Interstate Commerce Commission at the time."

It should be noted that following the suspension of the tariffs in question by the Board, a like suspension was made by the Interstate Commerce Commission, with the result that the former tariffs at the present apply in their entirety.

The order of the Interstate Commerce Commission on which the railway companies are opposing the application of the Terminal Company and seeking to justify their action, was made January 20th, 1914; the report of the Commission dealing with the question being found at page 212 enrrent volume of the Commission's reports.

the whole question being dealt with in an exhaustive judgment delivered by Mr. Commissioner Harlan.

The issue presented for determination by the commission was the legality of the allowances paid by public carriers, east of the Mississippi river, to industries on their rails that own and operate plant railways in connection with their industrial establishments. The judgment, with much clearness, establishes on the one hand the fact that, under the guise of a transportation service, these plant railways in effect have been performing a work which should legitimately be borne as part of the expense and operation of the plant facility—a work legitimately a manufacturing expense—purely a shipper's service, and not a transportation service the cost of which fairly can be included in the railway rate.

It is also clearly shown out that these services, which consisted (*inter alia*) in moving material from one point to another point in the same industrial plant, spotting and sorting cars all in the interest of the plant and not in ease of the transportation movement, result, on the one hand, in great expense to the line carrier, and, on the other hand, to a great advantage to the industrial plant; that such benefits were not conceded by the regular railways on any question of principle, but differed in degree in the case of the different industries which were fortunate enough to obtain them; so that in some instances the whole yard or industrial cost was absorbed by the railway rate, while in some instances only part; that in some instances all the work was performed by the railway company, while in other instances the work being done as it properly should be done by the manufacturing plant through its own railway was nevertheless paid for by allowances made by the line carrier either in whole or in part.

Apart altogether from any question of railway revenues, this of itself constituted a direct discrimination as between shippers, the large mass of whom have not industrial railways of their own of the character described in the opinion of the learned commissioner.

Specified industrial railways are considered in the judgment, and all of those considered were found to be railways constructed simply and purely for the purpose of the industry owning or controlling them, and not for the purpose of performing a transportation service as a public carrier.

The declaration of principle laid down by the Interstate Commerce Commission appears to me to be just and sound. The fact of any railway of the character described obtaining any portion of a through rate simply means that the industry obtains upon all its shipments carried under the rate a rebate to the amount that the industrial line participates. The practice is illegal and discriminatory. It remains, therefore, to determine whether or not the Applicant Railway Company falls within the class of railway companies dealt with in the Order of the Interstate Commerce Commission.

As a matter of practice, the board in the past has dealt with international joint tariffs having regard to the outward movement only, and, speaking generally, has not interfered in any way with any tariff properly filed under American practice applying to the joint movement into Canada. The result is that a situation which otherwise might have presented difficulties has worked out along satisfactory lines and without friction.

While the board's jurisdiction to and from the International boundary is in my opinion absolute, the different industrial railways referred to in the judgment of the Interstate Commerce Commission are all situate in the United States. The originating carrier of traffic out of Canada so far as the Canadian movement is concerned is subject only to this board's jurisdiction; but I am of the opinion that we should implement the judgment of the Interstate Commerce Commission, and if any existing through tariffs out of Canada include industrial railways situate in the United States covered by the Order of the Interstate Commerce Commission, such tariffs will be suspended. The duty, however, of dealing with the Essex Terminal Railway devolves on this board. The authorized line commences and stops in Canada and the incorporation is Canadian. I am of the opinion that the question of incorporation is not a matter of

much importance. The jurisdiction of the character exercised by either the Interstate Commerce Commission or this board practically turns very little on any question except that of jurisdiction over the subject matter. The jurisdiction is *in rem* and not *in persona*. To illustrate: the Canadian Pacific Railway Company is a Canadian incorporation. It carries on business, however not only in Canada but in the United States. With an admitted jurisdiction over the company as such, in my opinion this board should not interfere with the practices and railway requirements which apply on any line either owned or operated by the Canadian Pacific in the United States. This country can give no right to the Canadian Pacific or any other line to build one foot of track in American territory. The only practicable and proper way of dealing with the matter is for this Commission not to interfere in a field which is entirely within the jurisdiction of either a State Commission or within the jurisdiction of the Interstate Commerce Commission itself. Under a parity of reasoning the jurisdiction of the Interstate Commerce Commission is of necessity similarly prescribed. The Michigan Central, for example, in its operations in Canada is subject not to American but to Canadian law. Its property is held and its operations controlled under Canadian statutes. The jurisdiction of both commissions stops at the International boundary.

Reference may be had to the board's judgment in Continental, Prairie and Winnipeg Oil Companies v. Canadian Pacific Railway Co. *et al.* 13 C.R.C. 156, and in particular to page 161.

It appears that the Essex Terminal Railway Company was incorporated by Chapter 62—A Dominion Act, 2 Edward VII.

The company was authorized to construct and operate a railway from a point at or near Walkerville through the townships of Sandwich East and Sandwich West in the county of Essex, to a point in or near the town of Sandwich, and through that town and the townships of Sandwich and Anderdon to a point in or near the town of Amherstburg. The company has constructed its line from a point west of the town of Sandwich; then to the south of the town and in an easterly direction through the township into the city of Windsor. It then runs in a southerly direction south of the city limit, and then turns again north running through the town of Walkerville and past the site of the Ford Motor Company's works.

The company also has physical connection with the Grand Trunk railway, Wabash railroad, Pere Marquette railroad, the Canadian Pacific railway, the Michigan Central railroad, and the Detroit River Tunnel Company. A large number of industries are situated on its tracks, a large proportion of which are not situate on any other line of railway, but obtain their car deliveries over the tracks of the applicant company.

The company claims that it is not at all comparable with industrial railways and is not in fact an industrial railway.

On the evidence, I find that some twenty-six factories have been directly served by the applicant company, and that, in addition to the service directly given these factories, the applicant company has spotted cars on team tracks in Walkerville, Windsor, Sandwich, and Ford, and also done a considerable amount of local switching for shippers generally.

The evidence shows the road which operates approximately 10 miles of track, with power of increase, to have cost $400,000.00, which has been supplied by the shareholders, no municipal subsidy or bonus of any kind having been received by the railway company.

The total earnings of the Company last year amounted to $51,333.66. The working expenses were stated to amount to about 60 per cent, which appears a reasonable allowance; so that the company's operations at the present time are netting roughly 5 per cent on the invested capital, certainly not an excessive return.

It was, however, claimed that the applicant railway as a matter of fact is owned and controlled by the Canadian Bridge Company; that the Canadian Bridge Company

is a subsidiary of the American Bridge Company, and that that company in turn is part of the United States Steel Corporation. The evidence on this point is not conclusive, nor, indeed, can it be said that there is any real evidence on that issue. The road was incorporated in the ordinary way necessarily through the medium of individual shareholders and directors. These shareholders are stated to be residents of Canada, with the exception of Mr. F. C. McMath, who resides in New York. The local shareholders are for the most part, at any rate, connected in some way or another with the Canadian Bridge Company. As stated, the evidence on this question is not at all satisfactory, but in my view it is unnecessary that the inquiry should be pursued. There is no reason why one course of treatment should be accorded to one company and denied to another simply because that company in turn may be owned or controlled by others. The matter of ownership is not one in which this board is concerned; the whole question is as to the character of the railway company itself, the service performed by it, and whether that service is a service of such a character as justifies the inclusion of a charge for it in a through rate; or whether, on the other hand, that service, on the case here made out, is in chief a service maintained for the purpose of obtaining special advantage for the Canadian Bridge Company over other shippers, and that services offered to other carriers are, on the one hand, merely a cloak for the original design or, on the hand, negligible in importance and merely accidental and the result of carrying out the main project.

This company has as stated, some ten miles of tracks. It is performing a service of transportation. It is catering for public business. It has, for example, laid, at the request of the city of Windsor, a special industrial spur for the purpose of opening up the industrial district of the city of Windsor, and on which spur several industrial plants have already been constructed.

The application is supported by counsel who appear for industries served by the company.

A petition was presented by counsel signed by ten manufacturing companies setting out the fact that such companies would not have located on the industrial site I have referred to had it not been for the service supplied by the Applicant Company, and the fact that deliveries by that Company to their plants were included in the through rate. Industries signing this petition are industries served by the special industrial spur above referred to. Their plants represent an investment of $960,000.

It might also be noted that it is not even suggested that these companies have any sinister connection with the Canadian Bridge Company.

Counsel also filed another petition presented on behalf of other manufacturers in the locality who were not located on the industrial spur, but were interested, and, as claimed, vitally interested in the service supplied their plants by the Essex Terminal Company. It was stated that the investment in the different plants interested amounted to $2,540,000.

A large part of the Terminal Company's business consists of work done for the Canadian Bridge Company. Out of a total revenue of $51,333, $20,839 was received from that company.

Although this proportion is large, it is however, less than 41 per cent of the whole, and may be contrasted with the proportional public and private business of the class of railways considered by Mr. Commissioner Harlan, who, at page 227 of his judgment, states:

> "The road that has most nearly the appearance of a terminal road claims only 3 per cent of outside traffic. Moreover the record shows that, generally speaking outside business is not solicited, but, on the contrary, is disregarded. In the great majority of instances there is no real outside traffic. Where any such traffic exists, it is almost negligible except in three or four cases."

The Company does not receive a flat switching or interchange rate; its charges being proportions of the through rates, varying according to the classification of the different commodities delivered to the different plants served by it.

No complaint has been made to the Board as to the fairness either of the different through rates, or as to the proportion the Essex Terminal Company enjoys. It might, however, be noted that on the business handled during the year ending January 31, 1914, for the Canadian Bridge Company, which as before stated, is alleged to own and control the railway company, the railway received a rate of 25·38 cents for each ton handled. During the same period the company carried over its tracks 16,103 tons for the Canadian Salt Company, with a return of $3,309.17, or a rate of 20·55 cents per ton; for E. Breault, a coal dealer, 2,410 tons, with a return of $485.50, or a rate of 20·15 cents per ton; for C. A. Chilver, Builders' Supplies, 274 tons, with a return of $29.44, or a rate of 10·74 cents per ton; for the Canada Siroeco Company, 1,156 tons, with a return of of $403.24, or a rate of 34·68 cents per ton; for Leggett and Platt, 143 tons, with a return of $38.06, or a rate of 26·62 cents per ton; and for the Trust Concrete Steel Company, 21,593 tons, with a return of $6,878.87, or a rate of of 31·85 cents per ton.

While the proportions of the rates are all on an arbitrary basis under the "Official" classification, the company has a minimum charge of $3.50 a car, and desires to obtain out of the through rates 2 cents on the first four classes, and a cent and a half on fifth and sixth; also one cent of commodity rates lower than the sixth class.

These rates, as such, have not been called in question. The evidence, however, shows that the Canadian Bridge Company is charged in the same manner as other shippers, and the returns show that the company would not seem to enjoy any special rate or privilege. The evidence on the other hand shows that the Canadian Bridge Company has a plant railway of its own, situate in its own grounds, and that less service is performed for the Canadian Bridge Company by the Essex Terminal than that company performs for other industries located on its lines, that it merely places loaded cars or empties for the Bridge Company on a designated track, that company taking the cars and placing them in its industrial plant as desired, without getting any rebate whatever. The evidence on that point is as follows:—

"The CHIEF COMMISSIONER: Are they charged in the same way as the others?

"Mr. WOOLLATT: Yes, sir; but they take cars and place them in their industry without getting one cent for their service.

"The CHIEF COMMISSIONER: So you just run out to the interchange track and deliver their cars on the interchange track owned by the local industry?

"Mr. WOOLLATT: Owned by the Essex Terminal.

"The CHIEF COMMISSIONER: But the local industry comes and takes them away and spots them for themselves?

"Mr. WOOLLATT: Yes.

"The CHIEF COMMISSIONER: They receive no remuneration for that?

"Mr. WOOLLATT: No. For other industries we take empties and place loads after they are so loaded.

The CHIEF COMMISSIONER: So the fact is you afford a lesser service for the company with which you are supposed to be in connection than you do for the general public, and allow them no rebate for it?

Mr. WOOLLATT: Yes. The various traffic gentlemen with whom I discussed this matter, after looking at the question as they have done, see no reason why we should be included in the list of railways or industries discriminated against

if these rates are cancelled. Sandwich also, sir, is a point which is not reached by any other railway. That will apply also to Ojibway, when we reach that point. Our charges to Amherstburg, if we go on to that point, remain to be seen."

I am of the opinion that there can be no question but that the line carriers have failed in their attempt to bring this railway within the terms of the Interstate Commerce Commission Judgment in the Industrial Railways Case, and to satisfy this commission that it should extend to that railway the inhibitions directed by the judgment as against the railway companies there considered. It would, on the contrary, appear that the action of the line carriers is actuated by a desire to increase rates. Had there been no terminal railway connecting the different line carriers and industries in Windsor, Walkerville and Sandwich, the tracks of the different railways are so situated that interchange tracks would, without doubt, have been ordered by the board, and shippers afforded the additional interswitching service between the different railways.

The position of the companies is that this work should be carried on in the future as in the past by the Essex Terminal Railway and not by the companies under the tariffs of the General Interswitching Order. The territory here being competitive, that service would largely have been performed at the expense of the line carriers. The companies do not propose to reduce their rates at all. The evidence abundantly supports this conclusion, and is as follows:—

"Mr. Fleming (Counsel for independent shippers): The position as I understand it is this. These roads will deliver at Amherstburg, 18 miles from Windsor at the same rate as at Windsor, the additional charge of the Michigan Central being absorbed in the tariff. It would be a great hardship to Windsor, and the other points to pay an additional switching charge, as it were, into their factories. If the railways require an additional freight rate, why, that is one question which I am not prepared to discuss now, but it is imposing a penalty on these factories located on the Essex Terminal if they are required to pay the through rate with the additional charge for the service of the Essex Terminal.

"The Chief Commissioner: Is not that the idea, Mr. Martin, that instead of reducing your through rates to Windsor by the amount which this company now gets, and which company is performing an interswitching service that you, under the general order, would have to perform? Is it the fact that you are going to absorb that instead of reducing your through rates?

"Mr. Martin: That we are going to absorb that?

"The Chief Commissioner: Yes, just keep up the rate and take what the Terminal Company is getting?

"Mr Martin: That depends upon what is finally decided as to the nature of this railroad and other roads of similar character.

"The Chief Commissioner: But supposing this falls within some prohibition rightly made, that there is some undisclosed evil which we do not know anything about, and that the public is in some way suffering from something, in remedying it do you propose to keep up the rates just as they are and take for yourselves and the other railways concerned in the longer haul as against this terminal movement the full through rates as they now exist?

"Mr. Martin: In other words, we would maintain their rates as they are and add the charge of this road to our charges?

"The Chief Commissioner: Yes.

"Mr. Martin: That would be the result.

"The Chief Commissioner: I see.

"MR. FLEMING: That is what we are fighting, Mr. Chairman.

"THE CHIEF COMMISSIONER: That is just simply what the result would be.

"Mr. CHISHOLM: That is the result under that Industrial Track decision.

"THE CHIEF COMMISSIONER: Then, if we turn round and disregard this line altogether and direct your companies to put in interswitching tracks so as to enable interswitching to be done under the general Interswitching Order, what difference would there be in the situation, Mr. Martin?

"Mr. MARTIN: The difference to us would be the cost of putting in all these tracks.

"THE CHIEF COMMISSIONER: It would cost you more money.

"Mr. MARTIN: I grant you probably it would.

"THE CHIEF COMMISSIONER: If the different railways had to look after this interswitching under the general order, they would be spending more money than they are under this system in Windsor. Is not that right?

"Mr. MARTIN: I have not any doubt answering your question specifically, Mr. Chairman, that it would cost the railways more to-day to furnish those facilities than it costs them to-day to use the facilities already there.

"THE CHIEF COMMISSIONER: Certainly. So the result would be that if this local interswitching service to the public was to be withdrawn, your line and the other lines would be enabled to absorb the charges of the present local company, and thereby get a greater revenue; but on the other hand, if the public were continued to be given this service they have enjoyed in the past, instead of your getting a greater revenue out of your through rate, as a matter of fact you would be getting less?

"Mr. MARTIN: Yes."

The result is that not only has no discrimination been shown between shippers in this neighbourhood, but that the alleged control by the Canadian Bridge Company has in no way injured any other shipper; but it also appears as the result of the admission made by a representative of the opposing companies, that, instead of the line carriers obtaining a smaller revenue as the result of the operations of the Essex Terminal Railway, their operations are carried on actually at less cost.

The suspension of the tariffs and supplements will be continued.

Assistant Chief Commissioner Scott and Commissioners McLean and Goodeve concurred.

Order, disallowing tariffs, issued.

RE G. T. R.—ASHBRIDGE BAY SPUR.

Judgment, Chief Commissioner Drayton, May 7, 1914:

The application in this case was made by Mr. Raney on behalf of the owners of property abutting on Ashbridge's bay, and who claimed riparian rights, including the right to use, for the purposes of navigation, Ashbridge's bay and channels connecting such bay with Toronto bay.

The application in form asked for the recission of the board's Order No. 20288, dated September 8, 1913, which authorized the Grand Trunk Railway Company to construct a branch line commencing at a point on the portion of its railway known as the Ashbridge's Bay spur, east of Cherry street, Toronto; thence extending in a southwesterly and southerly direction along and across what is known as the 150-foot roadway, and across Keating's channel for a distance of 135 feet; thence in a southerly and southeasterly direction a distance of 2,415 feet in the Toronto harbour industrial district.

The application came on for hearing at Toronto on January 26, 1914. It was opposed by Mr. McMaster, who appeared for the Toronto Harbour Commissioners, and by Mr. Geary, corporation counsel for the city of Toronto.

It is alleged that the spur in question, carried as it is across Keating's channel by a permanent structure, prevents the navigation of that channel, and prejudicially affects, if not, indeed, renders valueless, the boatbuilding plants situate on Ashbridge's bay, the owners of which ask a recission of the previous order.

It appeared that the order complained of was made by the board on the consent of the city and the Toronto Harbour Commissioners, and that the property owners for whom Mr. Raney appeared had not been advised of the application nor had any knowledge of it; and that there was nothing before the board which would in any way indicate that any rights of navigation were being interfered with. On the contrary local matters of navigation being entrusted to the care of the Toronto Harbour Commissioners so far as this board is concerned, the information before the board would be that from the standpoint of navigation the construction of the spur was unobjectionable.

It further developed that, as a matter of fact, the spur was built for the Toronto Harbour Commissioners, the letter from the Harbour Commissioners' Engineer, filed with the Board, stating that the Commission was anxious to have the track constructed at as early a date as possible. It has also developed that the use of the track was necessary for the reclamation of the district and the carrying out of the Harbour Board's plans.

The result is that the real opposition developed at the hearing to the application was made on behalf of the harbour commissioners and the city. There is no doubt that, had the board been aware of any question of riparian rights in Ashbridge's bay, including rights of navigation through the channel, no order would have been made without notice to those interested. Two remedies were open to the applicants—the first being the remedy at law, and the second the remedy which is now sought by the application to this Board.

It developed at the hearing that the applicants had already brought an action against the city, to which action the Harbour Board was joined as party defendants, in which, among other remedies, a declaration of the right of navigation in Ashbridge's bay was specifically sought.

It was further developed at the hearing that the case had been tried by the Honourable the Chancellor; that the evidence had all been taken; and that the case now stood for judgment.

The Board's view under such circumstances was that the application should stand until judgment was delivered, the question of navigation being common to both issues. The case was accordingly adjourned; but, on the undertaking of the Harbour Board to get out boats manufactured in any of the boat-building plants on the bay ready for delivery up to May following the hearing.

The application as adjourned was listed for hearing at the last sittings of the Board on April 24th, 1914. It was removed from the list of cases to be heard as the result of the letter of Messrs. Mills, Raney and Co., which is as follows:

> "We have your notice of the 9th instant advising us that this matter will be on the list for hearing at the next meeting of the Board in Toronto on the 24th inst. The matter was adjourned at the last sitting pending the decision of the Chancellor in actions then standing for judgment involving the question of navigability to Ashbridge's bay and Keating's cut. Since then the judgment of the Chancellor has been handed down and is in appeal. We presume the matter will have to stand over until the determination of the appeal.
>
> "We suggest that the matter stand off the list to be brought on by either party on notice to the other and to the Board after determination of the appeal.

"We are sending a copy of this letter to Messrs. McMaster, Montgomery and Fleury, solicitors for the Harbour Board."

The judgment of the Honourable the Chancellor finds that the applicants have no rights of navigation in Keating's channel or Ashbridge's bay. Apart from the question of navigation, there is no ground on which the application can be supported. The appeal that is mentioned in Messrs. Miller, Raney and Company's letter is the plaintiff's appeal.

An issue has now arisen between the parties as to the terms on which the hearing of January 26, 1914, was adjourned, the position taken by Mr. Raney being that the undertaking given by Mr. McMaster, and on which the adjournment was made, was that the applicants should have uninterrupted access to Toronto bay until the questions in controversy were determined. On the other hand, Mr. McMaster contends that the Railway Commissioners are only responsible to the extent of getting out boats manufactured between the date of hearing and May, if such boats could not be got out through the channel. The question is one of considerable importance to the applicants, but there is but little room for any discussion as to the terms on which the adjournment was made. The record on the question is as follows:—

"The CHIEF COMMISSIONER: What harm will be done by letting this stand for a couple of months?

"Mr. RANEY: There is just this about it, sir: these men have not been taken into the confidence of the board; these men have running industries, going concerns.

"Mr. MCMASTER: They are not doing anything there to-day.

"Mr. RANEY: If you will pardon me, these men for months past—for two years in fact—have been kept constantly on tenterhooks; no one has told them what is going to happen to them; the Harbour Board will disclose nothing to them; and they do not know whether if they manufacture boats they can get them out or not. They build their boats in the winter; they do not wait until spring.

"Mr. MCMASTER: We will get their boats out for them.

"The CHIEF COMMISSIONER: Will you undertake to get out any boats they manufacture?

"Mr. MCMASTER: We will undertake to get out any they manufacture between this and next May. We will take them out on a train, if necessary.

"Mr. COUSINS: (Engineer, Harbour Board): We can get them out without damage.

"The CHIEF COMMISSIONER: Without cost to them?

"Mr. MCMASTER: They can go out under their own power.

"The CHIEF COMMISSIONER: Supposing the boats cannot get out?

"Mr. MCMASTER: If we have to carry them out—if they cannot float out—we will carry them out at our expense. If they can float out, they should go out under their own power.

"The CHIEF COMMISSIONER: Of course, Mr. Raney does not want anything else.

"Mr. RANEY: I have no objection that the matter should stand over on that undertaking. There is just this point about it, that the Chancellor may not decide that question of navigation.

"The CHIEF COMMISSIONER: Then, I suppose we will have to deal with it. Any boats that they manufacture between this and May, you are going to get out for them if they cannot get them out through the channel."

The Harbour Board must remove, without cost to the applicants or any of them, any motor boats which they now have ready for delivery. It is not necessary to go into

the question as to when they were finished, etc. The spirit of the undertaking was that the applicants were to be put in the position of being able to make delivery of boats ready for market within the time stipulated, and that if the bridge in question prevented such boats going out under their own power, the boats would be removed without expense to the applicants by the Harbour Board.

A list of boats ready for delivery must be submitted within one week to the Harbour Board, and the Harbour Board's responsibility in its undertaking will cease just as soon as such boats have been placed by the Harbour Board in Toronto bay, if, as a matter of fact, they cannot be floated through the channel.

No further order is made, and the board does not pass one way or the other upon any question of navigability of the stream, that question being covered by the judgment of the Honourable the Chancellor, and the application having been postponed for the purpose of enabling the pending appeal from it to be prosecuted to conclusion.

Assistant Chief Commissioner Scott concurred.

LOCATION OF STATION ON C.P.R. AT COQUITLAM, B.C.

Judgment, Chief Commissioner Drayton, May 7, 1914:

This is an application of the Canadian Pacific Railway Company for an order approving of the location of a station at Coquitlam, British Columbia, as shown on plans filed with the board.

The original application in this matter, which has been very much debated, came on for hearing at a sitting of the board held in Vancouver on November 29, 1912.

Although the application was in form an application by the Canadian Pacific, the burden of the application was assumed by the Coquitlam Terminal Company, a real estate corporation that was desirous of having the station moved from New Westminster to a point in Coquitlam nearer to that company's property; and the question of railway facilities was, in the manner the case was then presented, not much dwelt upon and was a question of only subsidiary importance.

The board has found that such consideration would afford no ground for the removal of the station from New Westminster; and that no station should be moved simply for the purpose of furthering real estate interests in one quarter as against those in another, or advancing the interests of a new townsite.

After the hearing, but before judgment on the application was delivered, an inspection of the existing facilities at New Westminster was made by Commissioner McLean and myself. We then came to the conclusion that, while conditions necessitating a change might arise in the future, no change at that time was necessary in the public interest.

A further application made by the company was heard at a sitting of the board held in Vancouver on May 19, 1913, when it was stated, on behalf of the company, that, while it was desirable in its view that, in order to make necessary additions to the existing facilities, a station should be built in Coquitlam, at the point indicated on the plan filed, it was confident that a majority of those interested in the locality would, in their own interest, be in favour of obtaining the increased facilities, that the application would not be pressed by the railway company until a vote had been taken on the question for the purpose of determining what the real local interest was. Accordingly the municipality of Coquitlam passed a referendum by-law, entitled The Port-Coquitlam Station Referendum By-law, which was submitted to a vote on September 29, 1913.

The question submitted gave the ratepayers the option of expressing their opinion in favour of building the new station (1) at the north end of the school road; or (2)

on the present location; and the certificate of the city clerk on the result of the poll is as follows:

For removal	178
Against removal	70
Ballots spoiled	3

which, of course, means that, of this vote, a large majority favoured building at the north end of the school road rather than on the present site.

Following the vote, the municipality of Port Coquitlam made an application for an order directing the Canadian Pacific to build a new station at the north end of the school-house road.

The municipality of Coquitlam, on October 8th, passed, and subsequently filed with the board a resolution in favour of maintaining the station on the present site.

The fairness of the referendum has been challenged in a series of papers lodged with the board by those opposing the application for a change of site, and numerous petitions have been received.

At the sittings of the Board held in Vancouver on October 27, 1913, Mr. MacIntyre appeared for the city of Coquitlam and asked that the application of the city for the construction of a station at the foot of the school-house road in Coquitlam be listed for hearing. The request was granted and the application heard at the same sitting, Mr. Cowan appearing in the interests of those desiring the station to be retained on its present site and Mr. Peters appearing for the Canadian Pacific.

It developed at the hearing that objections to the vote were based, not only on the allegation that the school-house road site submitted to the ratepayers was an undesirable one, but also on the further allegation that the vote approving of the proposed removal had been carried as a result of the votes of non-residents. It is of record, however, that 148 residents voted, and that only 70 votes were recorded in favour of the present site; so, crediting the whole of the 70 votes to ratepayers residing in the locality, the most that can be said on the ground of local convenience and the wish of the local ratepayers is that, to say the least, they are pretty equally divided on the question, and that there is no public expression of a preponderating interest requiring the station to be maintained on its present site.

Undoubtedly some property owners will be damaged by the station facilities being placed further east. Any change in the location of railway facilities of necessity damages some one. It, on the other hand, may benefit many. The question is one of collateral rather than main importance. The board's desire to ascertain whether the existing facilities, in view of changed conditions and increased traffic, are or are not sufficient; and, if not sufficient, whether they can be made sufficient and convenient on the present site; or, failing this, what, in the public interest, is the best location for a station at Coquitlam. The public interest here referred to has nothing to do, in the first instance, with the question of real estate values one way or the other, or real estate damages; it is the preponderating interest of those who will use the station in question—the people in Coquitlam and the surrounding district who are entitled to proper and sufficient transportation facilities.

It was further shown at the hearing that those opposed to the removal of the station were of the view, as already stated, that the site selected by the municipality was improper. In reference to the municipality's proposition on the one hand and the site urged by the railway company on the other, the record is as follows:—

"Mr. COWAN: Of the two evils, I think the schoolroad is perhaps the worst. I do not think there is much doubt about that.

"The CHIEF COMMISSIONER: Why? It is much nearer to you.

"Mr. COWAN: It is a blind street. It is a foolish act. Immediately west there is a swamp. There is no present means of access to it or egress from it

without gum boots or something of that kind. I think your engineeer would very quickly say that was preposterous.

"I may mention, too, that the railway company will practically confirm what I say.

"The CHIEF COMMISSIONER: Oh, yes they want it down their way.

"MR. COWAN: They want it at 16.

"THE CHIEF COMMISSIONER: You are with the Canadian Pacific on the question of the school road?

"MR. COWAN: Yes."

As matters now stand, it has further to be noted that both the old site and the new site are within the limits of the same municipality; and the position of the city is that, if the situation at the foot of school-house road is an improper situation, the municipality would rather that the increased facilities which they claim are necessary in the interests of increased transportation, should be afforded the public on the site suggested by the Canadian Pacific, than that an attempt should be made to provide them at the present site.

The board had no notice that the case would be considered, and had no papers with it at the time of the hearing; hence the matter had of necessity to stand for judgment.

Since the hearing, the board has had further inspection made of the location and of the proposed sites. Mr. Spencer, who is now the board's chief operating officer, has reported against the present site; and that, in the interests of safety and better accommodation, a new station should be provided. A material part of his report is as follows:—

"The traffic, both freight and passenger, to and from Westminster, is transferred to and from the main line at Westminster junction, for which purpose the company is running eight mixed trains per day over that branch, all between 8 a.m. and 11.15 p.m. These trains all use the "Y" track mentioned for the purpose of coming to the platform at Westminster Junction Station, and pass out on the main track for the purpose of switching, loading and unloading express, baggage, etc., and for the purpose of running to the west leg of the "Y" to turn the engine or cars, or both, on each trip; and, as the cars for the freight shed at Westminster junction and for team track delivery or loading stand upon the siding, the said siding being on the inside of the curve of the "Y" track, a dangerous situation is created, these cars and the freight shed itself intercepting the view of the train using the "Y" track from pedestrians going to and from the station, access to which is reached only by crossing the tracks from Dewney Trunk road at east end of the platform.

"There is a hotel located on the north side of the tracks immediately opposite Westminster Junction station. The entrance to this hotel is from the company's right of way, and people cross the track from the platform to the hotel quite freely; and, as there are two main tracks and switching lead there, another dangerous condition obtains, both as regards the main line movements and the turning operation of the Westminster Branch train.

"The passenger station is an old building with one or two lean-to's attached, and in this pile there are two waiting-rooms, freight, ticket, and telegraph offices. While the building was clean, it is decidedly out of date and too small for the accommodation of the travelling public, especially during bad weather.

"The railway company states that they handle nearly 100 passengers a day to and from Westminster. The ticket sales locally at Westminster junction

for the month of November show 1,981, an average of 66 per day. The freight business locally at Westminster Junction shows for the month of November:—

Received	674 tons.
Forwarded	473 "
Total	1,147 "

and, in addition, carload shipments of gravel to Vancouver not handled on the siding mentioned—3,803 tons."

On the question of the siding opposite the school-house road, Mr. Spencer reports:

"At the side opposite school-house road, the company has not sufficient land to put in a suitable building without encroaching on the highway, which, at that point, is very narrow; and it is too close to Shaughnessy street.

"The company's location is 1,310 feet, or 640 feet farther, from Shaughnessy Street than the school-house road site, and will, therefore, provide ample space for a standard train to stand clear of Shaughnessy street. This site is also nearer the centre of the present population, and consequently central for the majority of people.

"My recommendation is that the company's application be approved."

The board also had Mr. Kerr, its engineer for the district, consider carefully the layout plan prepared by Mr. Webster and the layout plan as prepared by the Canadian Pacific Railway Company, as well as the suggested site at School-house Road; and Mr. Kerr reports that, if Mr. Webster's plan were adopted, it would, in his opinion, interfere with the development of the city and prove detrimental to the interests of the public at large; that the site does not provide sufficient room for future trade, that it is at the extreme west of the city limits; that there is no room for handling freight; and that it would not be a desirable place for stock yards. He further reports that the street entrance to the freight sheds on Mr. Webster's plan would be dangerous, and might result in serious accidents due to the fact that it crosses the Westminster branch line; and his final conclusion is that, with the city's interests in view, as well as in the interests of the company, and the general public, the company should be authorized to place its station on the site selected by it—immediately east of the north end of Kingsway road.

The board has very carefully considered the different sites, and has been at great pains to arrive at a proper disposition of the case, especially in view of the fact that the earlier settlers, in the west part of the city, near the present location, will be more or less injured by the removal of the station,—a fact which would certainly forbid removal but for the paramount claim growing out of questions as to the safety, accommodation, and convenience of the general public in the locality to be served by the station.

The board is now satisfied that the railway facilities in Coquitlam have become insufficient—that it is necessary for the company to enlarge its yard, extend the sidings and provide passing tracks; our engineers are of opinion that the layout of the "Wye" at Westminster junction does not admit of necessary extensions at that point; and a very strong objection to the site is the fact that the team tracks and freight shed can be reached only by crossing one or other of the main line tracks.

So everything considered, I am of the opinion that, not with a view to assist in the sale of real estate, but in the general interests of the public in the locality, the board should grant the company's application, authorizing it to erect its station for Coquitlam on the site immediately east of Kingsway road—on terms to be included in the order.

1st. That the station platform be extended to the school-house crossing to give convenient access from that point to the station.

2nd. That the railway company deed to the municipality, free of cost, a strip of land, say, 20 feet in width, to widen the road from Westminster junction to the proposed new station; any dispute as to the exact width or dimensions of the said strip to be settled by the Board.

3rd. That the company give the municipality, as per offer already made, the steel bridge referred to at the hearing, on terms to be agreed upon between the company and the municipality, in case the municipality desires to secure the said bridge.

4th. That the company will not close its station at Westminster junction without first obtaining the consent of the Board, it being understood that, under present conditions, the said consent is withheld.

Commissioners Mills and Goodeve concurred.

Judgment, Chief Commissioner DRAYTON, July 18, 1914.

The judgment annexed hereto was prepared and ready for delivery before the Board's last trip to the West. It was held back by reason of the fact that, while the Board had no doubt as to the correctness of the conclusions arrived at, it might be that by reason of changed circumstances and conditions the order should not be made, the Board's feeling being that if the present facilities were at all adequate the station should be kept where it is in view of the settlement which has taken place in its immediate vicinity.

As a result of the inspection which I made last June, it is apparent that business has so much decreased as to render it possible for the station to remain where it is for the present. Before ascertaining this the Board was advised by Mr. McKenzie, the mayor of Coquitlam, that in the interest of the future development of Coquitlam it should be known without greater delay as to whether or not the station would be moved, and where its ultimate location would be.

I have no doubt that the check in business is but temporary, and that the existing facilities will in the near future be insufficient.

In view of the request of the municipality that the matter should be settled without delay, the Board's judgment already referred to will now be delivered.

Commissioner GOODEVE concurred.

Ordered accordingly.

APPLICATION MADE BY THE MONTREAL LIGHT, HEAT, AND POWER COMPANY FOR AUTHORITY TO LAY A THIRTY-INCH GAS PIPE FROM THE COMPANY'S NEW WORKS ON THE LACHINE CANAL ACROSS THE PROPERTY NOW UNDER LEASE BY THE GRAND TRUNK RAILWAY COMPANY FROM THE DEPARTMENT OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS, CADASTRAL NOS. 1005, 1026, AND 1025, PARISH OF LACHINE, NEAR THE WESTERN END OF THE TURCOT YARDS.

Judgment, Chief Commissioner Drayton, May 20, 1914:

The case came on for hearing at Montreal on Friday, May 15, 1914.

After argument, judgment was reserved, and the matter was referred to the board's chief engineer to report on the engineering questions involved.

It was thought at the hearing that it might be extremely dangerous to allow a gas main of such a diameter to be laid under railway tracks, more particularly having regard to the fact that the ground was soft in character and that the plans of the railway company would call for the utilization of this property for yard tracks, resulting in more or less hammer owing to the imperfect character of the ground on the proposed gas main.

Mr. Mountain has since reported that the work can be carried on safely, as, under the tracks of the Grand Trunk, the trench can be excavated down to solid ground. This, of course, must be done. Mr. Mountain is of the view that the work can be authorized without endangering the public safety on the condition that it be carried

out to the entire satisfaction of the Chief Engineer of the Grand Trunk Railway Company.

The point at which the power company desires to cross the railway company's property is not on line with any street, and the company is in the same position as any other landowner, subject, of course, to the sections of the Railway Act which give the board jurisdiction for certain purposes over the company's property.

The work involves the occupancy of the railway yards to an extent of about 1,200 feet.

Mr. Chisholm, who appeared for the railway company, objected that the application could not be supported under any section of the Act, and that the pipe could not be authorized under the provisions of section 250, which, as he submitted only gives rights of application to the municipality or adjacent landowner. The section referred to by Mr. Chisholm, and which is invoked in support of the application in subsection (*b*) of section 250 of the Act, and is as follows:

> "Any municipality or landowner desires to obtain means of drainage, or the "right to lay any pipes or other pipes, temporarily or permanently, through, "along, upon, across or under the railway or any works or land of the company; "the board may, upon the application or complaint of the municipality or land- "owner, order the company to construct such drainage or lay such pipes, and "may require the applicant to submit to the board a plan and profile of the "portion of the railway to be affected, or may direct an inspecting engineer, "or such other person as it deems advisable to appoint, to inspect the locality "in question, and, if expedient, there hold an inquiry as to the necessity or "requirements for such drainage or pipes, and to make a full report thereon "to the board."

Subsection 3 of the same section also provides that:

> "The board may upon such report, or in its discretion, order how, where, when, "by whom, and upon, what terms and conditions, such drainage may be affected, "or pipes laid, constructed, and maintained, having due regard to all proper "interests."

It appeared at the hearing that this company is a land-owner, and an adjacent land-owner, and as then intimated by me I am of the view that, as a matter of law, the board has jurisdiction to make the order asked.

It was claimed by the company at the hearing, that, in order to serve the public and discharge the obligation resting on the company as a public utility, it was absolutely necessary that gas should be conveyed across the railway company's property in order to furnish a supply to a very large number of the inhabitants of Montreal. I find that there is no question at all as to the public necessity of the work, nor is there any other way in which the necessary access can be reasonably obtained except across the railway company's property. Under these circumstances, I am of the view that an order should be made.

The railway company, however, should be treated just in the same manner as any other owner of property would be entitled to be treated. Not only should the work be carried out to the reasonable satisfaction of the railway company's Chief Engineer so as to insure safety to the travelling public; but arrangements should be made so as to enable water to be pumped from the gas main, or the gas main to be otherwise cleaned, or repaired, without interfering with the railway company's operations.

The Gas Company must be at the full responsibility of the maintenance of the pipe and indemnify the railway company from any loss, damage, or injury to the railway company's property or employees, or to the travelling public on the company's trains.

Treating the railway company as a private land-owner, the gas company should either make an agreement with the railway company as to the amount of damages, if

any, that are sustained, or, failing an agreement, exercise its powers of expropriation (if it has any), so as to fix the amount of compensation by arbitration. If the Gas Company has no such powers of expropriation, and it can only go across the lands in question on the board's order, further application may be made to the board for a direction as to the assessment of damages.

I think the board has jurisdiction under the Act to impose these terms and conditions as conditions precedent to the exercise of the authority which I think should be conferred.

Should the requirements of the railway company's engineer as to the layout and character of the work be, in the opinion of the Gas Company, unreasonable, those details will be settled by the Board's Chief Engineer. Commissioner McLean concurred. Reported in 17 Can. Ry. Cas. 330.

APPLICATION BY J. H. MCPHERSON FOR AN ORDER DIRECTING THE CANADIAN PACIFIC RAILWAY COMPANY TO CONSTRUCT A SIDING FROM A POINT ON ITS MAIN LINE TO THE APPLICANT'S STONE QUARRY IN LOT 22, CONCESSION 7, GORE OF PUSLINCH, WELLINGTON COUNTY, ONTARIO.

Judgment, Chief Commissioner Drayton, May 20, 1914.

The application was heard on April 24, 1914, at the sitting of the board held in Toronto.

It was opposed by the railway company, the matter argued, and the judgment of the board withheld until the engineering difficulties which were urged by the company at the hearing could be checked up by an engineer of the board after a view of the *locus in quo*. This inspection has been since made and a report received by the board.

The objections taken by the company were in a large part based on the ground that the switch would entail breaking the company's main line at a point between seven and eight miles west of Guelph junction. The line at the present consists of but a single track. It was urged, on behalf of the company, that it was one of the busiest portions of its line, and that between forty and fifty trains passed the point in question each day; and that railway traffic was so heavy that the company was now contemplating double-tracking.

The report of the board's engineer shows that the spur applied for would leave the main line only 2,700 feet west of an existing quarry spur; that the main line grade is ·757 per 100 feet; that west of the spur in question the track is straight, but that to the east there is a curve only a short distance away; and that one mile farther west there is another spur, with the result that the main line track has already been cut in two places between Puslinch and Leslie, a distance of about seven miles.

There is no question at all but that the practice of breaking the main line tracks for industrial switches at points where trains are operated at high speed is more or less dangerous.

Mr. Guthrie, who appeared for the applicant, pointed out the fact that the company had put in other switches, and that there would be no more danger with this switch than there was with the others. This is undoubtedly true. On the other hand, because the company has made a mistake in the past, or for the purpose of obtaining freight has to some extent jeopardized the safety of its trains, is no reason why the board should either countenance or follow the practice.

Switches have often been put in in the past when they were practically unobjectionable in view of light traffic on the line and slow movement, and they are extremely difficult to get rid of when the conditions have changed.

The question narrows itself down to that of determining whether the applicant should be accommodated by an extension of the Maloney Quarry spur—which would cost probably some $4,000, and possibly about $3,000 more than a direct spur would cost—or safety of train operation on the other hand be imperilled.

To my mind there is no room for doubt that the application should be refused. I think, however, that, if the applicant desires to have a spur run to his property from the Maloney Quarry spur, an order should be made.

In case, however, the line is double-tracked, the objections disappear.

The switch can be built with a grade of 1·35 away from the main line, and with the double track will become a trailing switch, which cannot fairly be described as dangerous.

The applicant, therefore, has the option of either waiting until such time as the line is double-tracked for his spur, or having spur accommodation afforded by the extension of the Maloney Quarry spur on the applicant's complying with the terms of section 226 of the Act.

Concurred in by Commissioner Goodeve.

CITY OF HAMILTON AND T. H. & B. RY.—SPUR ACROSS VICTORIA AVENUE SOUTH.

Judgment, Chief Commissioner Drayton, May 21, 1914:

This case involves the question of the construction of a spur carried on an overhead structure across Victoria Avenue South in the city of Hamilton, Ontario, to the premises of the Gillies-Guy Coal Company.

The coal company, apparently, had applied to the railway company for the spur, and as the railway company was of the opinion that the coal company was entitled to the spur, the railway company made application, under sections 222 and 223 of the Railway Act, for an order authorizing the spur construction.

The application was supported by the consent of the Corporation of the City of Hamilton, which was duly filed with the Board, the consent reading as follows:

> "That no objection be made to the issuing of an order by the Board of Railway Commissioners for Canada providing for the construction of a siding by the Toronto, Hamilton and Buffalo Railway Company into the premises of Gillies-Guy, Limited, and crossing Victoria Avenue overhead, in accordance with the plan submitted, with the following modifications: Providing for a pier or support to the east of the present sidewalk on the east side of the street, and carrying the tracks without any further support to the west side of the street in a line with the outer edge of the sidewalk on that side of the street produced; the whole of the work of construction on the street to be satisfactory to the city engineer, and the Toronto, Hamilton and Buffalo Railway Company to indemnify the city in case of any claims on account of the construction and maintenance of this overhead crossing. The privilege hereby granted to be during the pleasure of the council."

This action was taken by the city council at its meeting on the 31st of March, 1914.

The Board subsequently, by order numbered 21618, authorized the spur construction, and by the terms of the order required the railway company to indemnify the city from and against any claims on account of the construction or maintenance of the overhead crossing, leaving the question of details of construction to be determined by the Board's chief engineer; and further providing that the authority granted to construct the overhead trestle should be without prejudice to the rights of the city to make application for its removal.

Although the order bears date April 7th, 1914, the order, as a matter of fact, was not issued to the parties until April 14th, 1914, when certified copies were forwarded to them, which would not be received in the ordinary course until April 15th, 1914.

On April 16th, 1914, the Board received a letter from the city clerk withdrawing the city's consent on the grounds that the company had refused to accept the terms and conditions contained in the consent filed, the city clerk's letter being dated April 15th.

A formal application to rescind the order subsequently received stated:

> "Should the construction of the said overhead spur be proceeded with, it will render it impossible for the corporation to place Victoria Avenue at a proper grade to enable vehicular traffic to pass along Victoria Avenue to Charlton Avenue. The city corporation has expended large sums of money in purchasing lands for park purposes between Wellington and Wentworth Streets and South Charlton Avenue, and there is no access to said lands from the west, except the said Victoria Avenue and a narrow passage at the west of said park lands."

The application further stated that, on April 16, the solicitor for the railway company was advised that an application would be made to rescind the order; and that he was further advised not to order any material for the construction of the overhead spur in question. The company's formal answer to the application—besides taking a general issue on the different matters alleged by the corporation—further alleged that the company had already ordered all the material required for the work before the 16th of April; that a large proportion of it had been received; that some of it was then in transit; and that, if the board's order was rescinded, as prayed for by the city, heavy damages would be sustained, not only by the railway company but also by the coal company, which had also, before that date, placed large orders for material to be brought in on this branch line.

The city's application to rescind the order was heard in Hamilton on the 23rd of April, 1914.

It appeared at the hearing that material had been ordered as the company alleged.

It was established, on behalf of the city, that the proposed Mountain Park was not only in actual contemplation, but that certain property had been purchased; and that it was necessary to improve the grade on Victoria avenue.

The reason the consent was given was explained by Controller Morris, of the city corporation, as follows:—

> "I think I have the reason, Mr. Chairman. It may seem to you a very simple thing, and you may not be able to understand how some of the members of the council would act that way; but here really is the secret of the whole thing: At the present time the face of the mountain is not beautified; it is not a park at the present time, and some of them have the idea that this would not be very important as an approach to the park perhaps for 5 or 10 years; and they said that if it meant for a long period—5 or 10 years—during the pleasure of the Council, by the time it is beautiful and put in shape, this will have to come down."

The Company denied the practicability of any park construction to the south either in the near or distant future.

Judgment was reserved by the board for the purpose of making an inspection of the premises. This has since taken place.

I am of the opinion that, while it will probably take some time and a good deal of money, the park project is perfectly feasible, and that nothing should be done to defeat it.

Without doubt, the only reason why the corporation moved to open the matter up was based on the fear that the board might not give effect to the necessities of the park and the advisability of having the approaches kept in such a manner as to conform to park requirements.

I do not think that the corporation gave the consent idly or with any idea of factiously withdrawing it to the prejudice of the coal company, and with the inevitable result that money should be wasted without the slightest possible object.

I am further of the opinion that the grade of Victoria avenue can be well improved by the city, as the city engineer submitted. At the same time, it probably

will take a good many years before the park construction is carried to a point where the city would be injured at all by a spur. A large part of the expense has already been incurred for the material which has been ordered; and I do not think that the board's order should be at the present rescinded. The structure, however, must not only be constructed but maintained so as to afford proper head-room for Victoria avenue having regard to the new street grade which may be adopted by the city engineer; and the parties must understand that, as soon as the park requirements are such as to require removal of the spur, that situation will be regarded as a good and sufficient reason for the issuance of an order removing the structure over Victoria avenue and without remuneration either to the railway or coal companies.

Commissioner Goodeve concurred.

CONSUMERS' GAS COMPANY OF TORONTO v. C.P.R.

Judgment, Chief Commissioner Drayton, May 21, 1914:

The application made by the Consumer's Gas Company of Toronto for a reduction in local rates within the Toronto Terminals on coke was heard, in the first instance, at Toronto on the 24th day of April, 1914, when it was adjourned to Ottawa so as to enable the railway companies to put in evidence as to the terminal costs involved.

This evidence was furnished to the board at the meeting in Ottawa on Tuesday, the 19th day of May, 1914.

Boards of Trade and others interested being advised of the basis of the railway companies' figures, and the results, for the first time requested that the general matter of local switching charges should stand.

There has been a great delay on the railway companies' part in furnishing the board with their data as to costs and the board was of the view that the complaint of the Consumers' Gas Company should not be delayed until the larger matter was disposed of, but that an interim order should be made.

It appeared from the Canadian Pacific Railway Company's tariff C.R.C. No. E-1681 that the Canadian Pacific carried coke from Toronto to Lambton at a rate of 30 cents. The charge made by the railway companies for carrying coke from the Esplanade in Toronto to North Toronto was 95 cents, and the rates were hopelessly out of line, notwithstanding the fact that for the movement from the Esplanade to North Toronto a far greater occupancy and use was made of the expensive Toronto Terminals.

It was claimed, on behalf of the Canadian Pacific Railway Company, that the Lambton rate had been cancelled. On the tariffs produced before the Board, that cancellation had, however, been postponed, so that the 30 cent rate, on the evidence before us when sitting, showed that coke could still be moved from Toronto to Lambton, a distance of 6·4 miles, at 30 cents, as against the movement from the Esplanade to North Toronto on 8·1 miles for 95 cents.

The judgment of the Board delivered at the hearing was that the rate should be reduced from 95 cents to 60 cents a ton, and that the rate should be divided between the two companies—30 cents to the Grand Trunk and 30 cents to the Canadian Pacific.

The Canadian Pacific now complains that the board was mistaken in finding that the Lambton coke rate had not been cancelled. Mr. Hardwell has since gone carefully through all the files, and he finds that, in Supplement No. 33 to the original tariff which the board had before it, which supplement took effect June, 1912, the rates on coal and coke from the Toronto Terminals to Lambton, as well as to other similar stations, were withdrawn and cancelled.

The result, therefore, is that, so far as existing Lambton rate is concerned, it cannot be said that the company is violating the long and short haul clause of the Act. But the Lambton rate was only an illustration of the inequalities that the situ-

ation presents. As a matter of fact coke is brought, in the first instance, from the Consumers' Gas Plant by the Grand Trunk and is handed over to the Canadian Pacific at the transfer track in West Toronto.

Referring to Grand Trunk tariff C.R.C. No. E-2855, item 57, it will be seen that the Grand Trunk provides a rate of 40 cents from Toronto to Weston. The movement of coke to Weston must pass through West Toronto, the distance to Weston being 8·41 miles, while the distance to West Toronto is less than 5 miles. This tariff has not been cancelled nor advanced, so that, as the tariffs stand to-day, in so far as the line of the originating carrier of the commodity in question is concerned, the judgment of the Board can be amply supported.

As was stated at the hearing, the order is merely temporary. The Board has no intention of making any rate which will not be remunerative, and it may be that all the rates are not only out of line, but on too low a basis.

Before the question of costs could in any proper sense be passed upon, the companies had to submit their data. The great delay that has taken place is chargeable solely to them.

In my opinion, the rate of 60 cents as ordered should stand.

Assistant Chief Commissioner Scott concurred.

Ordered that the joint rate on coke, in carloads of a minimum weight of forty thousand pounds per car, from the complainant's siding on the Esplanade in Toronto to the sidings of the Canadian Pacific Railway Company at North Toronto, be reduced from ninety-five (95) cents to sixty (60) cents per ton of two thousand pounds; to be made effective not later than the 22nd of June, 1914.

COMPLAINT OF THE ST. MARY'S HORSE SHOE QUARRY, OF ST. MARY'S, ONT., AGAINST THE ALLEGED REFUSAL OF THE GRAND TRUNK RAILWAY COMPANY TO OPERATE ON THEIR SIDING UNLESS THE QUARRY COMPANY PAY FOR REPAIRS MADE TO SUCH SIDING BEFORE THE GRAND TRUNK RAILWAY HAD ANY AGREEMENT WITH THE QUARRY COMPANY.

Judgment, Mr. Commissioner GOODEVE, May 22, 1914:—

This case was heard at Berlin on April 22, 1914, before the Chief Commissioner and myself and is the application of R. H. McWilliams of the St. Mary's Horse Shoe Quarry Company to be relieved of the expense of maintenance and interest charged upon the spur of the Grand Trunk Railway Company into his property.

It would appear from the evidence that this spur has been in existence a good many years, and came into the possession of Mr. McWilliams as the purchaser of the assets of the Horse Shoe Quarry Company. It was originally installed under the usual siding agreement, and it was claimed by Mr. Chisholm, on behalf of the Grand Trunk Railway Company, that Mr. McWilliams, as the purchaser of the property, became liable under the agreement. This was disputed by Mr. McWilliams. It was further stated by Mr. McWilliams that in 1911, when the Canadian Pacific Railway approached him for connection with his quarry, Mr. Pettigrew at that time divisional freight agent of the Grand Trunk Railway at Stratford, had stated that if he would not allow the Canadian Pacific Railway to make connection with his property, but would give the Grand Trunk Railway his entire tonnage, they would relieve him of the expense of maintenance of this spur, and reduce his rental or interest charges to the nominal sum of one or five dollars per year. For that reason no connection was given the Canadian Pacific Railway. In support of this at the hearing he stated that a cheque for two hundred dollars, given by him as security for cost of repairs, was returned to him by Mr. Pettigrew. While Mr. Chisholm, on behalf of the Grand Trunk Railway Company, denied this statement, he was unable at the time to give any satisfactory explanation of why this cheque had been given and afterwards returned.

Mr. Chisholm produced their regular siding agreement signed by Mr. McWilliams containing the usual conditions under which the applicant was to pay for the cost of maintenance and interest charges. Mr. McWilliams claimed that this was signed by him under pressure in the midst of a busy season, the Grand Trunk having refused to handle his business otherwise.

Mr. Pettigrew was not present at the hearing, as he is now stationed at Montreal. Judgment was therefore reserved in order to obtain more information with regard to the cheque.

Since the hearing a letter has been filed by Mr. Chisholm under date of May 13, 1914, enclosing copy of a letter from Mr. Pettigrew explaining what had taken place, and verifying his explanation by means of a letter written by him on April 22, 1911, to Mr. McWilliams and Mr. McWilliams' reply thereto under date September 25, 1911, copies of which are also on file. Mr. Pettigrew's statement being that at the date of his negotiations with Mr. McWilliams they were endeavouring to obtain the use of this spur for the St. Mary's Portland Cement Company who were about to locate there, and that as consideration for the use of the spur it was suggested that the Grand Trunk should assume the cost of repairs and reduce the interest charges in exchange for the use of that portion of the tracks which would be necessary to serve the Cement Company's plant.

There was owing at this time a bill for repairs previously made, and there were some repairs that would be immediately required to insure the safety of the operation of the spur, and it was as security for these latter repairs that a cheque for $200 was deposited with the G.T.R. Company by Mr. McWilliams, the understanding being that this was to be held until the final disposition of the negotiations for the use of the spur by the cement company. These negotiations fell through and a separate spur was constructed for the cement company. But for some reason which does not appear, the cheque was returned.

Mr. Pettigrew's letter does not make it clear whether the cheque was returned before or after the signing of the regular siding agreement by Mr. McWilliams. If afterwards that would be sufficient explanation. In any event there is nothing to show that the cheque was returned because of any agreement made by Mr. Pettigrew to assume on behalf of the company the charge of maintenance and interest. On the contrary, this being the usual siding agreement signed by Mr. McWilliams who is a capable business man and must have known the purport of the agreement, and who, the evidence goes to show had paid for the repairs up to the time of the dispute, I think his application to be relieved should, therefore, be refused.

Chief Commissioner Drayton concurred.

APPLICATION OF THE EDMONTON CITY DAIRY FOR AN ORDER REQUIRING THE DOMINION EXPRESS COMPANY, UNDER RULE C OF THE COMPANY'S SPECIAL CREAM TARIFF, C.R.C. 4139, TO REFUND 5 CENTS PER CAN ON THEIR CONSIGNMENTS TO EDMONTON BETWEEN THE EFFECTIVE DATES OF THE SAID TARIFF, VIZ., OCTOBER 15, 1912, TO SEPTEMBER 17, 1913, INCLUSIVE, APPLICANTS BEING OUTSIDE OF THE DELIVERY LIMITS AND NO DELIVERY SERVICE HAVING THEREFORE BEEN FURNISHED.

Judgment, Mr. Commissioner McLean, May 22, 1914:

The rules on which this application turns are contained in tariff C.R.C. No. 4139. The rules which are pertinent to the present application are rules 1-3 inclusive, which are as follows:—

> "1. The above charges include the delivery of filled cans and collection of empties for the dealer at all points where the Dominion Express Company furnishes a collection and delivery service for other goods.

"2. In the case of shipments by a dealer, if filled cans are collected by the Dominion Express Company and shipped to a place where this company does not furnish a collection and delivery service for any kind of goods, the above charges shall apply.

"3. In places where a collection and delivery service is not furnished by the Dominion Express Company, the charges—except as in paragraph (2) shall be 5 cents per can less than the above rates."

The question involved in the present application is the limitation, if any, in rule 1 of the obligation of the Express Company in regard to the deduction of the sum of 5 cents par can when collection and delivery service is not provided for, the provision in this regard being set out in rule 3.

In rules 2 and 3, the word "place" is used as equivalent to a station or office, and at such station or office the Express Company holds itself out to accept from or deliver to a person, there presenting himself, any article of express business. The station or office, of course, serves an area of territory. It may be located in a town or village. The area, however, which the station or office aforesaid will serve depends on the needs of business, not on the municipal limits.

The word "point" as used in rule 1 is also concerned with locality. Here, also, there is a station or office. But, in addition, there are the incidents of collection and delivery. Does the fact that the word "point" as used appears to be tied up with a situation where the Express Company "furnishes a collection and delivery service for other goods" mean that the area served by the office or station located at such "point" is removed entirely from the obligations of rule 3? Such in sum is the contention of the Dominion Express Company.

In a considerable number of cases, Edmonton being one of them, reasonable delivery limits have, on the application of the Express Company, been fixed by the board after inspection by one of its officers. Edmonton, which is a "point" falling within rule 1, serves an area of territory which is subdivided into (*a*) a portion of territory in which there is a delivery and collection service, (*b*) a portion in which no such delivery and collection service exists. As to the latter, it may as in the cases falling within rules 2 and 3, extend either to the municipal limits or beyond, as business may demand.

Now, since the existence of an area of territory adjacent to a "place" or "point", and in which no collection and delivery service is performed, is common not only to rules 2 and 3 but also to rule 1, it follows that any interpretation which will say that in respect of such area of territory it shall, because it is adjacent to a point where there is a collection and delivery service, be treated as if the collection and delivery service were also performed within that area,—for that is the effect of not making the deduction as provided for in rule 3,—must depend on explicit words. No such explicit words are to be found in the rules, and it, therefore, follows that as to the area adjacent to a "point" but not included within the collection and delivery area the deduction of 5 cents per can as set out in rule 3 should be made.

The express company contends that if a ruling is made that the applicant is entitled to a reduction, there should be an accounting as between him and the express company by way of set-off. The position of the express company in this respect is set out in a letter on file, as follows:—

"We do not feel, however, like making any further concessions to these dealers, particularly in the case of the applicant, who, we think, owes us considerable money by reason of the fact, admitted by Mr. Prevey in his evidence before the board, that a large number of cans of sweet cream for domestic purposes were received by him and paid for on the basis of the sour-cream rates during the period in which the order of September, 1912, was in effect. In fact, Mr. Prevey stated that he had never paid anything but sour-cream rates. (Evidence of this case commences on page 11296 of the record.)

"The evidence of Mr. Palleson, of Calgary, indicates clearly that the proportion of sweet cream for domestic use is 25 per cent of the whole quantity shipped.

"Mr. Prevey's complaint of November 27, 1912, contained a statement of traffic carried by the various companies for him for the month of July, 1912. Such statement shows that for various distances there were carried over our lines the total number of 4,243 cans. Assuming that to be an average month and multiplying the number by twelve, it gives a total of 50,916 cans for the year—25 per cent of which was sweet cream for domestic use. Apparently, therefore, we carried at the sour-cream rates 12,729 cans on which should have been charged the sweet cream or Scale N rates, during the period in which the order was in effect. From Mr. Prevey's evidence, it is reasonable to assume that he has never paid the proper rate on sweet cream shipments.

"While we believe that our interpretation of the board's order is reasonable and that the complainants are not entitled to any rebate on the traffic moving during the period in which the order referred to was in effect, we feel that if there is to be any reaccounting between the applicants and the express company, the board should require the applicants to take into consideration the undercharges on the shipments moving previous to that period."

In dealing with the complaint of the applicant, what is before the board is a request for a declaration as to what is provided for in the tariff as to the reduction to be made in the rate when a delivery service is not performed. It appears proper to give such a declaratory ruling.

The respondent requests the board to require the applicants to take into consideration undercharges which it alleges existed, reference to which has already been made in the extract from the letter from the express company already quoted. But the obligation is on the express company to collect in accordance with the tolls in its tariffs legally published and in force. Section 344 of the Railway Act sets out the proper procedure where there is a refusal or neglect, in whole or in part, to pay lawful tolls on demand. Such being the case, the necessity or usefulness of a direction in the matter from the board does not appear.

Chief Commissioner Drayton, Assistant Chief Commissioner Scott, and Commissioner Goodeve concurred.

G.T.R. v. HAMILTON RADIAL ELECTRIC RY. CO.

Judgment, Chief Commissioner Drayton, May 23, 1914:

The tracks of these two companies were connected with the approval of the board at a point at or near Burlington.

The interchange track becoming congested, the board's operating department recommended that the interchange track be lengthened to accommodate from 10 to 15 cars. The question arose between the two companies as to which should pay for the track extension. To make the extension it was necessary to use Grand Trunk property and it was urged that this therefore was a sufficient contribution to the cost by that company and that all the charges of construction should be borne by the Hamilton Radial.

Held that the extended trackage added largely to the Grand Trunk's facilities at that point and that a fair disposition of the matter would be that each company should bear one-half the cost.

Commissioner Goodeve concurred.

Ordered accordingly.

SESSIONAL PAPER No. 20c

APPLICATION OF B. SHRAGGE, OF WINNIPEG, MAN., FOR AN ORDER DIRECTING THE CANADIAN PACIFIC RAILWAY COMPANY TO CONSTRUCT A SPUR TO SERVE THE APPLICANT'S WAREHOUSE IN THE CITY OF WINNIPEG, MAN.

Oral judgment delivered by Chief Commissioner DRAYTON at the close of the hearing, May 26, 1914:

An order will be made for the construction of an industrial spur across the street —subject to conditions, which conditions will apply generally to industrial tracks in Winnipeg, unless the companies can hereafter convince the board that a change should be made.

Those conditions are:

1. That the railway company will indemnify the city corporation against any loss or damage, costs or expenses, that the city may be put to or suffer in any way by reason of neglect or default of the company.

1st—in the construction of the spur.

2nd—in the operation of the spur.

3rd—in the maintenance of the spur, such as lack of repairs, etc.

By way of explanation under the last head, I may say that the company must maintain the spur at a proper level with the street where crossed, so as not to impede traffic at any time; must observe the general provisions of the Railway Act as to highway crossings—that the spur be kept at a height, as I recollect it, of not more than an inch above the immediate travelled portion of the road; and must maintain, not only the rails, but also the highway within the rails and for a distance of 18 inches from the outside of the rails on each side. That, after thirty days' notice, the company will, unless otherwise directed by the board, remove the spur and restore the highway to its original condition; the notice requiring removal of the spur to be given under the city's seal, and to become operative and binding in ten days from the date of delivery to the railway company, unless the company, within the said ten days, applies to the board for leave to continue the spur.

There has been a very great deal of unnecessary friction in connection with these spurs. I do not think that the city has any real idea of stopping industrial development one way or the other; but it is time for a clear understanding.

The board some years ago reviewed the Holstein order that Mr. Hunt speaks of. Under that order the municipality might tear up tracks; but my predecessors in office, very wisely, decided that the municipalities of the country should not be allowed to tear up railway tracks, and that the only body which keeps any record of them should be charged with that responsibility. The practice of the board has since been to reserve to municipalities desiring the right to remove tracks, in the original order authorizing the spur the right to apply to the board for its removal; and all the difficulty that has arisen in connection with industrial spurs in Winnipeg has practically hinged upon that point; the question has been whether or not these things were to be done decently and in order by the tribunal charged with that duty to the public.

The terms I now suggest, give to the municipality a great control. In effect it means this: the municipality in giving notice—which is to be a considered action by the municipality as such—may demand that the spur be removed. Such notice will become operative, unless there are reasons why it should not; and, if the company thinks it can show that the said notice should not become operative, it may at once apply to the board to stay the effect of the notice given.

The application, instead of being an application by the municipality with the onus on the municipality, becomes an application by the company to continue its use of the city streets; and this method of procedure places the matter in, as we think, a very safe and reasonable position,—reserving to the municipality every interest that can be thought of.

Order issued in accordance with the judgment.

COMPLAINT OF G. T. ROGERS, OF COLEVILLE, SASK., RELATIVE TO AN ALLEGED OVERCHARGE BY THE CANADIAN PACIFIC RAILWAY COMPANY, ON A CAR OF SETTLER'S EFFECTS FROM BROOMHILL, MAN., TO COLEVILLE, SASK.

Oral judgment delivered by Chief Commissioner DRAYTON, at the close of the hearing, May 28, 1914:—

The board, as I have said, has no jurisdiction to order refunds. If it had such jurisdiction, I would order a refund in this case.

It is quite clear that the duty of railway companies is to bill by the shortest and cheapest route, irrespective of the hauls which may inure to one company or the other, or the point of transfer, or the relative profit to be made as the result of hauling by either line. Whatever the most direct and the cheapest point of transfer is, that point of transfer should be taken. While that is the duty of the railway company, there is no doubt that the shipper has the option of throwing away as much money as he wants to throw away—that is the shipper's privilege just the same as it is the privilege of anybody else. But, as a rule, the shipper knows nothing about the cheapest route; he certainly knew nothing about the cheapest route in this case, and he was not told by the shipping clerk, who should have known the proper rate and the saving which could be effected.

Apparently from the statement read to-day by the clerk, the shipper protested against the large charge asked, which would appear to be $102.80 on the car. It is not stated in the written document read—at least, if it was I do not recollect it—as to what the exact amount for the whole movement would be when worked out in dollars and cents. As I recollect it, merely a rate per hundred pounds was quoted. If the exact amount had been given, it is quite clear it would have been on the basis of $102.80, because that is the amount the company came here to argue for to-day.

Now, that was an improper rate. It was not the legal rate; it was not the rate which could be got upon the shortest and most direct haul. The rate should have been $77. Then, the statement says the shipper asked to have the shipment made to Biggar, where he was advised he could get a $60 rate on the car. So far as the information before him at that time was concerned, he knew that he could send the car to Biggar for $60; and, had he known that it would cost $102.80 to send it to Coleville, as billed by the Canadian Pacific Railway clerk or agent, there is not much doubt as to what he would have done. Further, I do not think that there is any ground for question as to what Biggar he thought was referred to,—that it was the Grand Trunk Pacific Biggar, from which he could get his transfer easily and quickly via the Grand Trunk line to Coleville; and doubtless he thought he was making the best and cheapest arrangement, while he had no proper information as to the rate.—information such as the clerk should have furnished. The shipper was not told that by the Canadian Pacific Railway billing it would cost him $35 more than was necessary; and, if the facts had been given to him, he certainly would not have asked to have the car shipped as it was billed by the Canadian Pacific Railway clerk or agent.

I am dealing with the matter entirely from the company's standpoint. I am not dealing with it from the standpoint of the shipper, who denies these instructions. On the broad general issue, it is the business of the companies and not of shippers to inform themselves as to rates; and when a farmer goes to the railway company and gets quotations as to rates from one point to another point, that farmer has the right to get the lowest rate that is available for the movement. He did not get it.

Sanction is hereby given for the refund in this case, which is all we can do.

Mr. DREW: On the basis of the published rate?

The CHIEF COMMISSIONER: On the basis of the published rate, which is $77.

SESSIONAL PAPER No 20c

COMPLAINT OF THE COWICHAN RATEPAYERS' ASSOCIATION, ON BEHALF OF ADAM GORDON OF HILLBROOK, B.C., RELATIVE TO ALLEGED INADEQUATE CULVERT ON HIS PROPERTY ON THE LINE OF THE ESQUIMALT AND NANAIMO RAILWAY COMPANY (CANADIAN PACIFIC RAILWAY).

Oral judgment delivered by Chief Commissioner DRAYTON at the close of the hearing, June 8, 1914:

The company's answer as filed rests entirely on the ground that the original drainage was properly and sufficiently looked after. Surface drainage was supplied. That surface drainage was the only thing necessary at that time. The works, Mr. Gordon, the applicant, now wants are for the purpose of improving his property. There is a local Act in which it is provided that proceedings may be taken; that is quite obvious from a perusal of the Act—proceedings may be taken for the purpose of securing drainage; and the assessment of the cost is by a betterment rate on the property to be benefited under the local improvement system. By the said Act, section 251, a portion of the resultant expense is placed upon the railway company.

The estimate of the engineer is that the lowering of the culvert three feet, with the necessary digging and supplying of pipe, will cost $250 or $300. The railway company must do the work. If there is any dispute, plans showing the layout will have to be filed for examination and approval by an engineer of the board; and that engineer must see that the drainage will be adequate for the land at the south, in order that there may be no more trouble about the matter. The work must be commenced by the company within thirty days—how long does the company want to finish it?

Mr. MCMULLEN: Thirty days.

The CHIEF COMMISSIONER: Very well. Commence the work within thirty days, get your pipe on the ground, and have the job completed within two months.

The cost will be distributed in this proportion: the company will be at the first expense; and, of the total amount—the $250 or $300, as the case may be—Mr. Gordon, the landowner, will contribute $50.00.

Ordered accordingly.

COMPLAINT OF THE EASTERN TOWNSHIPS BRICK & MANUFACTURING COMPANY OF LENNOXVILLE, QUE., *Re* INTERSWITCHING.

Judgment, Commissioner S. J. MCLEAN, June 19, 1914.

Complaint is made by the Eastern Townships Brick & Manufacturing Company of Lennoxville, Que., that the Boston and Maine Railway Company has refused to absorb the interswitching charge on coal received over its road to the plant of the applicant, which is located on the C.P.R. tracks within the interswitching limits at Lennoxville.

When the matter was brought to the attention of the Boston and Maine, it stated that its understanding was that the interswitching order applied only to Canadian traffic; and it developed that this railway had never given effect to the interswitching order by issuing a tariff applying to points in Canada. When the matter was brought to its attention, necessary steps were taken to make a tariff effective.

Prior to this being done, there had on January 20, 1914, been interswitched from the line of the Boston and Maine to the plant of the applicant at Lennoxville twenty-three cars of coal, on which there were switching charges of $129.49. This represented the entire switching charge of the C.P.R. under the interswitching order. This was charged back against the Boston and Maine, which in turn collected it from the applicant.

The question before the board is as to whether the obligations of the interswitching tariff now operative are retroactive.

The history as to the interswitching tariffs of the Canadian Pacific and of the Grand Trunk at Lennoxville and Sherbrooke is as follows:—

"Canadian Pacific C.R.C.E.-1234, on traffic between points in Canada, reductions and reissues effective September 1, 1908, advances September 10, 1908; on traffic to and from United States points, effective October 5, 1908. The C.P.R. have track connections with the B. & M. at Lennoxville.

"Grand Trunk tariff C.R.C.E.-1380, effective between points in Canada, September 1, 1908; between Canada and United States, October 1, 1908. The tariff reads at all stations in Canada where the G.T.R. have track connection. Track connection is made with B. & M. at Sherbrooke and Lennoxville."

The provisions of the interswitching order make it clear that where the interswitching service is performed, it should be performed subject to the rates and divisions thereof contained in the order; and the order has been in effect since 1908. Notwithstanding the fact, then, that for the reasons above set out, the Boston and Maine had not an interswitching tariff in force till recently, the rates as set out in the interswitching order are the ones which were proper to charge at the date when the cars of coal in question were interswitched. Under the interswitching order, it is lawful for the contracting carrier to absorb the toll charged for the interswitching of competitive traffic. Subject, then, to the power of the board in the case of discrimination, it is in the discretion of the contracting carrier whether it shall treat the traffic as competitive or not; and on what is before it, the board is unable to make any direction that the traffic shall be treated as competitive, or that the interswitching toll shall in its entirety be absorbed. The provisions of section 4 of the interswitching order are clearly applicable, and under this section the amount which may be collected by the contracting carrier is "an additional toll of not more than 10 cents per ton for any distance not exceeding four miles, nor more than $1.50 as the minimum and $4.00 as the maximum per carload." To the extent that the sum of $129.49 as charged by the Boston and Maine is in excess of the charge provided for the contracting carrier under section 4 of the order, the charge is illegal, and the difference should be refunded to the applicant.

Assistant Chief Commissioner Scott concurred.

AN APPLICATION OF THE BOARD OF TRADE OF STETTLER, ALTA., FOR AN ORDER DIRECTING THE CANADIAN PACIFIC AND THE CANADIAN NORTHERN RAILWAY COMPANIES TO PROVIDE AND CONSTRUCT A SUITABLE TRANSFER TRACK CONNECTING THEIR RAILWAYS WHERE THEY INTERSECT IN SECTION 4, TOWNSHIP 39, RANGE 19, WEST 4TH PURSUANT TO ORDER NO. 15084, DATED THE 11TH DAY OF SEPTEMBER, 1911.

Oral judgment delivered by Chief Commissioner DRAYTON at the close of the hearing, June 22, 1914:

The application in this case is for an interchange track between the Canadian Pacific and the Canadian Northern Companies at Stettler, Alta.

It is alleged in the petition that cars which have to be transferred from either line to the other cannot be transferred at Stettler, where the lines cross, but have to run out from the crossing to Lacombe, a distance of fifty miles; to Wetaskiwin, a distance of forty miles; or to Camrose, a distance of thirty miles; and then back to Stettler. It is said that the movement has actually taken that course.

As a matter of fact, as the town's representative very clearly points out, the traffic to the town originates at points farther distant from the town than the interchange tracks which already exist at other points. There are two interchange tracks between Calgary and Edmonton; an order has just been issued for the construction of one in Calgary; and it does not appear that there is any better reason for one at Stettler than at any other place on the line.

The same facts apply to the movement of goods outside the town, with the possible exception of flour from the local mill. Undoubtedly flour from the local mill would be delivered to points closer than the existing transfer tracks; and if there was a carload traffic delivered at points closer to Stettler than the existing transfer track, in so far as flour is concerned there would be some reason for ordering a transfer track at Stettler; but it is pointed out that the flour mill has no trackage accommodation at all; and, that being so, it would not be benefited by the transfer track asked for.

The real justification for the application, and probably the underlying and provoking cause of it, is the desire of Drumheller mines to sell coal at Stettler. The track would be used by that company, if they are right in their anticipation and can obtain access to the markets,—as they think they can if they get the transfer applied for.

There are other coal mines that serve those markets; but it is said by the Drumheller Company that its coal has better steaming qualities, and is urged that it should be allowed to enter this field. These representations and the request are endorsed by the municipality and by the Canadian Northern Railway Company.

The matter really narrows itself down to the question, should coal originating along the lines of the Canadian Pacific serve the territory opened up, or should Canadian Northern coal also have access to that territory.

There does not appear to be any public necessity for an ordinary transfer track at this point; but the Drumheller people seem confident as to their position, and I think we should do as was done by the board in a former case, where it was desired to erect a mill and make delivery of flour, mill-feed, etc., in a local territory within a distance which could not be reached by the nearest transfer point; that is, we should issue an order for the installation of an industrial spur at Stettler.

We think the Canadian Northern Railway Company should be authorized to construct the spur and to use such part of the Canadian Pacific Railway Company's property as is necessary to make a proper physical connection; and permission is hereby given to the Canadian Northern Railway Company to proceed with the work, if it thinks proper to do so; and, before the work is begun, the Drumheller Company shall deposit in a chartered bank the sum of two thousand dollars; and the whole of the said sum, or such portions of it as may be necessary, will be paid out to the Canadian Northern Railway for the construction of the spur hereby authorized. The right-of-way to be arranged between the two railway companies; and, if any difficulty arises in connection therewith, the point or points in dispute will be settled by the board.

This disposition of the case does not require the Canadian Pacific to pay anything for a construction which, if used, only takes business from that company; it simply gives the mining company permission to have the work done at its own expense.

In case the mining company is right and the traffic is there, it will not lose anything, as the order will provide that the Canadian Northern Railway Company shall rebate to the mining company the sum of $2 per car, until the money advanced for the construction of the spur is all refunded.

Mr. WARREN: So ultimately, Mr. Chief Commissioner, the Canadian Northern pay it all.

The CHIEF COMMISSIONER: No. If you get business which you would not otherwise get, it is quite right that you should pay in proportion thereto.

Mr. WARREN: But this is not our application for a transfer.

The CHIEF COMMISSIONER: I know it is not. It is quite clear what the movement is for; it is for the mines and the town. You get the road haul on the coal from Drumheller; and the town wants to get the Drumheller coal in without the cost of a comparatively long haul.

Mr. WARREN: That is their application, not ours.

The CHIEF COMMISSIONER: Certainly, it is their application.

Mr. WARREN: But we lose just the same. It is heads they win, tails we lose.

The CHIEF COMMISSIONER: No, Mr. Warren. What happens is this: you are going to get some traffic which you would not otherwise get. On this traffic you will pay a commission to the extent of the cost of the spur; and you will continue to get the traffic after you rebate the said cost.

Mr. WARREN: We should not rebate, Mr. Chief Commissioner.

The CHIEF COMMISSIONER: I do not know why you should not. I think you are really more interested in this than any one else.

Mr. WARREN: All right.

AN APPLICATION BY THE CANADIAN NORTHERN WESTERN RAILWAY COMPANY, UNDER SECTION 227, FOR AUTHORITY TO CONSTRUCT ITS LINE OF RAILWAY ACROSS THE MAIN LINE OF THE CANADIAN PACIFIC RAILWAY COMPANY IN THE CITY OF MEDICINE HAT, ALTA.

Oral judgment delivered by Chief Commissioner DRAYTON at the close of the hearing, June 23, 1914:

There is no doubt that, speaking generally, we should refuse to authorize grade crossings; but the time for universal refusal has not yet come. Many grade crossings have been allowed by the board; and, not a few have been authorized at the request of the Canadian Pacific Railway Company, at points no less dangerous than the proposed crossing in this case.

It may be that it would be possible—in fact I have no doubt it would be possible—to lift the tracks of the Canadian Northern as indicated by Mr. Sullivan. I am quite sure that any engineering work proposed or suggested by Mr. Sullivan would be feasible; and there is no question that the work could be done in the way he suggested. If, however, the work were done in that way, serious operating difficulties would undoubtedly arise.

The expense is, of course, a matter of minor importance compared with safety; but, with the elevated structure, under the layout of this city, the Canadian Northern would not, I think, be able to afford public facilities such a railway coming into the city should afford. It is quite true, as Mr. Sullivan says, that the mere fact of the town having agreed to a railway crossing over its streets at grade should not have anything to do with the question as to whether the Canadian Pacific line should be crossed or not. That is perfectly true. It is true, that so far as the board is concerned, it has to assume the responsibility of saying whether or not crossings shall be at grade. On the other hand, it is equally obvious that, from the standpoint of serving the public the railway should be brought in on the level, as the municipality desires, even at the expense of obstructing streets that may be affected.

The Canadian Pacific is entitled to the full use of its own right of way. The practice of the board is to regard the legal rights of the senior company. Mr. Sullivan says that, at this particular point, the Canadian Pacific contemplates double tracking, which means that a third line must be taken into account in the interlocking layout, as the three tracks will have to be protected. All the work will be done at the expense of the Canadian Northern, and the continued maintenance of the plant will also be at its expense. In operation, the trains of the Canadian Pacific have seniority. The plant will be operated by a watchman to be appointed by the Canadian Pacific and paid by the Canadian Northern.

A further stipulation is that the continuance of the crossing depends upon the observance of proper and fair conditions, one being that the Canadian Northern will not shunt over the crossing which is now allowed.

The board's engineer has gone over the layout; and, after careful consideration, has recommended the crossing at grade; and Mr. Spencer, the board's chief operating officer, concurs in the recommendation of our engineer.

The order, therefore, will go on the terms mentioned.

SESSIONAL PAPER No. 20c

CONSIDERATION OF THE MATTER OF THE REQUEST OF THE CITY OF WINNIPEG, MAN., FOR THE CONSTRUCTION OF A SUBWAY ON TALBOT AVENUE, WINNIPEG, WHERE IT IS CROSSED BY THE TRACKS OF THE CANADIAN PACIFIC RAILWAY COMPANY.

Oral judgment delivered by Chief Commissioner DRAYTON at the close of the hearing, June 26, 1914.

In this case the city desires a subway on Talbot avenue, on the ground of alleged public danger, which undoubtedly always exists in degree at all level crossings; and, on the further ground that the city desires to have a street car line constructed across the line of the Canadian Pacific at its crossing over this avenue.

I have no doubt that in so far as the street railway movement is concerned a subway is the proper means of crossing. Undoubtedly the street cars will be required to build up that section of the city; and, whether or not matters are yet ripe for the extension, there is no question that, in the long run, street car facilities will have to be given to that part of the city.

The city now agrees with the railway company in its application. The railway company protested against the making of Talbot street a public highway only as far back as 1909. The original application was made by the city on July 31, 1908. Notice was served on the railway company; and Mr. Hunt, the same year, on August 13, wrote to the board that he had been advised by the Canadian Pacific Railway Company that it would not consent to the crossing being made. The case came up for hearing, and at the hearing the crossing was opposed by the company, with the result that the matter stood for the board to inspect the locality. I do not know whether the inspection took place or not, as there is nothing on the record to show.

Mr. HUNT: Yes, it did.

The CHIEF COMMISSIONER: But the protest of the railway company was overruled, the wishes of the city were acceded to and the street was opened. The city is to-day saying what the railway company then said. The company said the crossing would be dangerous; the city now says that it is dangerous and on that ground has made application for a subway.

The company being senior, under the ordinary rule the costs would all fall upon the municipality. It is, however, a rule which, as I stated to Mr. Hunt, never appealed to me. I have continued to think that there should be a fairer division in all cases, because very often the question of priority is entirely secondary to the question as to the subsequent development of the highway or railway traffic, as the case may be; and the subsequent development, creating, as it does, the necessity for protection, should be considered rather than the original priority. Doubtless I am wrong in entertaining this opinion, as I notice that my predecessors have all taken the contrary view.

The number of railway movements on the one hand and the street traffic on the other hand very largely govern issues of this kind and determine the necessity for protection and its degree. I shall not use the railway figures in this case; I am simply going to take the city figures. It has been said by a civic representative that the traffic is much greater than it was—that the railway user is increasing very much; but taking the only statistics which have been furnished, we find that the contrary is clearly the case.

We have from the city a statement of the company's use of the crossing by its trains for seven days in November, 1912; and these figures, as summarized by the city tabulators, show that in seven days of that year there was a total of 1,257 train movements across the avenue in question. Then, taking the present year, including even the little gas car—which inclusion, I think, is not at all fair—we find that the total of the railway movements across the avenue, during a like period of seven days was only 644. Now, this is not what the railway company says; it is what the city is saying. So it is idle to pretend that the railway danger is increasing as has been

alleged. The fact, as shown by the city's own figures, is that, for a given period, the railway movements amounting to 1,257 in 1912 have fallen off to 644 in 1914.

It may, however, be said that times are dull and that business has fallen off. I have no doubt there is something in that; and I think the train movement will increase to some extent during the grain season—not perhaps to such a large extent as it would be owing to the changes the company is making. But the facts remain—that a condition created by the city, which the company said would be dangerous, is to-day said by the city to be dangerous,—very dangerous according to some of its representatives; and that the railway use, instead of increasing and making a subway necessary at the present time, is actually decreasing.

There are many crossings protected by gates where the traffic is heavier than at this crossing; so we will not at present order the construction of a subway at this crossing; but we will permit it. If the city is willing to construct a subway at its own expense, it may do so; I say at its own expense, because of the railway company's priority of title, and for the other reasons advanced.

On the other hand, we must not overlook the fact that there is a stretch of territory on each side of these railway tracks in which territory there is a considerable number of crossings; and the question of danger is but one of degree. Some of those crossings have been described by the city's representatives themselves as absolutely useless; so I think it would be well for the city to go at once into the whole question of proper access to that neighbourhood, with the view of the possible closing of some crossings and the proper protection of others. It has been suggested that the Nairn crossing is not very far away—some 600 feet, and that it would be a waste of money to put in a subway on Talbot avenue and maintain Nairn as a grade crossing. Hence, if the municipality, in the interests of public safety as it sees it, takes up the whole question, and decides to close one of these streets, an order will go for the construction of a subway at a proper point, to be fixed; and, although the Canadian Pacific Railway shows by the figures that in this case the equities, as well as its title, are on its side,—the cost will be borne in equal proportions by the railway company and the city.

CONSIDERATION OF THE MATTER OF THE CONSTRUCTION OF A SUBWAY AT THE CROSSING OF THE CANADIAN PACIFIC RAILWAY COMPANY OVER SALTER STREET, WINNIPEG, MANITOBA.

Oral judgment delivered by Chief Commissioner DRAYTON at the close of the hearing, June 26, 1914:

The subway in question is a structure which subject to proper details, is sufficient to accommodate the traffic of the railway company. There will not be any unreasonable interference with the railway, nor any danger to the public travelling on it. It is recognized by the applicant that the subway is to be entirely a municipal improvement. I am not saying whether it will be an improvement or not; whether the money, in part or in whole, will be thrown away; but it is called a municipal improvement,—and that is really the ground for the application.

Therefore, as the subway is to be simply a municipal improvement, the applicant does not ask that an order be made against the railway company for a contribution towards the cost; and hence, so far as the railway company, over which we have immediate jurisdiction, is concerned, and the safety of the public travelling over the structure, there is no question which calls for action by the board. Both interests are looked after and protected.

Strong representations have been made to the board that this will be a waste of public money; and I am not going to express an opinion as to whether it is or not. It is alleged that the proposed subway, 900 feet long, will be of very little use; and again the board expresses no opinion. Whatever the merits of the case may be, the facts are briefly as follows: the ratepayers of Winnipeg are acting through their council,—their

representatives, appointed to deal with such questions. That council has supported the construction of this subway, and does support it. In addition to that, the ratepayers have had a further safeguard—an opportunity of expressing their views on the subject. A vote was taken; and it has been pointed out that of 30,000 ratepayers qualified to vote on the question, only 1,900—considerably less than ten per cent—voted in favour of the proposition, and that, as a result of our enabling order, a burden of $1,250,000, perhaps a greater sum, will, at the instance of this very small faction of the ratepayers, be imposed upon the whole.

It seems to me that all this is the concern of the ratepayers and does not fall within the province of the board. We cannot interfere. It may be that the case is graver than most cases, as the amount of money is very large; but, in principle, the business of the board is to look after the interests of the travelling public, in so far as Dominion franchises are concerned, and the proper administration of them by Dominion companies. It is not our business to decide on the issue of municipal expediency, whether or not municipalities should make certain improvements. It is quite true that we could refuse this order; but to do so, we should have to proceed on a ground which is not open to us under any fair interpretation of the clauses relative to applications of this kind. In other words, the board cannot be looked upon as the guardian of municipalities in cases of this kind. In cases where the severance of grades has to be made by reason of questions involving matters of public safety, the issue is different. In such cases, we have immediate control, and we should exercise it; but in this case, the interests of the travelling public are not involved; and I think our duty is to give effect to the request of the municipality.

Detail plans will have to be submitted to the engineer of the railway company; and, in case of any dispute, the plans will be passed upon by the Board's Engineer.

As the application itself contemplates, the whole cost will be on the municipality; and the only bright thing about it is the evidence that Winnipeg has a great deal of money to spend in these matters, and will not be hampered by providing necessary protection for public safety at other points.

AN APPLICATION OF THE MANITOBA SAND AND GRAVEL COMPANY OF WINNIPEG, MAN., UNDER SECTIONS 315 AND 323, FOR AN ORDER DIRECTING THE GRAND TRUNK PACIFIC RAILWAY COMPANY TO AMEND ITS SPECIAL FREIGHT TARIFF C.R.C. NO. 279, DATED THE 21ST NOVEMBER, 1912, AS TO ITEM 10 ON PAGE 5, SO AS TO PROVIDE AN EQUITABLE RATE ON SAND AND GRAVEL FROM VIVIAN STATION, MANITOBA, TO THE CITY OF WINNIPEG, MAN.

Oral judgment delivered by Chief Commissioner DRAYTON at the close of the hearing, June 26, 1914:

The applicant company's position is that it cannot be sure that the fact of the rate charged by one company being lower than that charged by another company, constitutes discrimination rates to be discriminatory have to be charged by the same company in order to give rise to a *prima facie* case under the Act. The only thing to be done, is to show what a reasonable rate is; and that question is dealt with in the judgment on the Western Rates Case.

It is disposed of under the heading of Building and Paving Material:—

> "Building and paving brick, stone, gravel, sand, and clay are provided with low mileage commodity tariffs in the east and in the west. In the west, slightly higher rates are charged by the Canadian Pacific in Saskatchewan and Alberta than in Manitoba and New Ontario, a difference not observed by the Canadian Northern, which carries the lower scale over its whole system. Both companies' scales are lower than those charged east of the lakes, except on dimension and coursing stone, the western rates on which are slightly over the eastern."

Now, the relief given there, and the only relief which can be given, is the order in that connection, namely, that the companies divide their initial ten-mile group by

adding to the tariff one of the five miles at two cents per hundred pounds on brick, gravel, stone, and clay, and two and a half cents on dimension and coursing stone, with the result that the minimum charges will be as stated, in place of the higher rates.

In as much as the Board found, after a long and exhaustive inquiry, that the rates on sand in the west were not unreasonable—that the western rates on this commodity were lower than the eastern rates, it did not seem that there was any room for interference by the Board.

Here one company has put in a rate which is lower than that of another company. No doubt it has done so for the purposes of its own business; and its rate may possibly be an experimental one; but the mere fact that, for a given service, one company has voluntarily put in a rate which is lower than that of another company, would not justify the Board in ordering another company to put in the same rate.

The application is dismissed.

A COMPLAINT OF THE CITY OF FORT WILLIAM, ONT., AND PROPERTY OWNERS, RELATIVE TO THE CONDITION OF THE GRAND TRUNK PACIFIC RAILWAY ON EMPIRE AVENUE, FORT WILLIAM, ONT.

Oral judgment delivered by Chief Commissioner DRAYTON at the close of the hearing, June 27, 1914:—

I do not know why it is, but I do know that this matter is in a very unsatisfactory shape.

The initial mistake consisted in allowing the railway company to construct along the highway in question, without the property owners on that highway, or at least a majority of them, having been parties to the construction. I am not quite sure whether Mr. Peltier was in the council at the time or not; but I am quite sure that the city's business was properly looked after. What then operated on the minds of the councillors no doubt was the benefit which would likely accrue to the people of Fort William as a whole,—a praiseworthy object, but one which would not for a minute justify the council in injuring the property owners on Empire avenue; and, also the fact, or perhaps I should not say the fact but the anticipation, that the laying of the company's tracks on Empire avenue would add to the value of the property on that avenue by making it directly available for industrial sites. That may or may not be so. There is one thing, however, which invariably occurs,—that is, that whenever railways are built on highways, we are sure to have the sort of mix-up that appears here to-day.

In this instance, the whole matter has direct reference to the agreement. The property owners are bound by their representatives, subject to whatever the board could do for them. The board gave them the right to arbitrate their claims in all cases in which they thought they were damaged, thus enabling them to obtain fair and proper compensation for all real damages under the statutes relating to arbitration. It is true that property owners who have subsequently purchased cannot get the benefit of this provision; but that is scarcely a hardship, as they have bought with their eyes wide open, knowing that the railway was there; and, in view of what the board has already done, as stated above, it cannot properly be said to be a hardship on the original property owners. If they have not taken advantage of the right to arbitrate, with a view to compensation, the fault is their own.

There is only one other thing the board can do. By an amending order, the provisions of the highway sections can be made to apply. What I mean is this. By the section of the Act dealing with highway crossings, the railway company is made responsible for maintaining the highway at crossings over its tracks. The result is that this railway company is under obligation to maintain, not only its rails, but also that part of the highway which it occupies, so that it is safe for vehicular traffic. In some instances, the company has failed to do this part of its duty.

Hence the direction of the board is to the engineer to make a further inspection of this line, to find out what is necessary to be done, in order to bring the condition of the railway structure on Empire avenue and the crossings thereon up to the standard required for highway crossings. Copies of the reports will be sent to the parties, and action will be taken thereafter.

APPLICATION OF THE COUNTY OF WELLAND TO RESCIND ORDER 20134, AUTHORIZING THE TORONTO, HAMILTON AND BUFFALO RAILWAY COMPANY TO DIVERT FOUR HIGHWAYS.

Judgment, Assistant Chief Commissioner SCOTT, July 2, 1914:

By Order of the Board No. 20134, dated the 16th August, 1913, the Railway Company was authorized to divert certain highways. At the hearing the township of Pelham was heard; and, after considering what was submitted, the board issued the order in question. It now appears, that in the case of one of the highways—the one between lot 5 in concession 12, and lot 5 in concession 13, township of Pelham—that the proper municipal body having jurisdiction over the highway, the county of Welland was not notified. That highway is a county road and it is proper that as the county was not notified of the sittings and no representations from it were considered by the board before the order was issued, that the order in so far as it affects that highway, which is commonly called "Sutton's Crossing," should be reconsidered.

As far as the other three diversions are concerned, while I do not agree with the decision the board came to, it must be recognized that as the proper parties were heard before the order was issued; and, as there are no new facts submitted to warrant the board in varying its decision, that the matter should be considered closed and the application in so far as it affects these three diversions, dismissed.

In so far as the Sutton Crossing is concerned, it is submitted by the county that the highway running east and west, which the Railway Company desire to close, is more important than the highway running north and south, which the Railway Company left open. I think the order in so far as it affects this highway should be cancelled; and, that the Railway Company be permitted to put in a right angle crossing of the highway over the railway at the point where the road running east and west crosses the railway; and, that the less important highway—that running north and south—be left as it is. Or, if the Railway Company wishes, that it also be made a right angle crossing.

If the Railway Company thinks that a connecting link between the north and the south road and the east and west road north of the railway is desirable, so as to enable people to go from one highway to the other, without crossing the track at all, it should be permitted to build such a diversion; and, be authorized to take, without the consent of the owner, the land necessary for its construction.

Judgment, Mr. Commissioner MCLEAN, July 23, 1914:

By Order 21400 of February 10, 1914, Order 20134 of August 16, 1913, was rescinded as to the diversion of a highway as provided for between lot 5, concession 12, and lot 5, concession 13, in the township of Pelham. By the latter order the highway running east and west was diverted north of the railway into the highway running north and south, and the crossing of the railway on the line of the east and west highway was closed. By the former order, provision was made for a diversion north of the track, the closing of the crossings of both highways over the line of railway, and the opening of a new right-angle crossing; all of this being as shown on plan "A" attached to the order in question.

The reason for the rehearing is set out in the memorandum of the Assistant Chief Commissioner. Aside from the correction as to the proper parties to be notified, no new facts were brought forward which would, in my opinion, justify a departure from the disposition made by Order 21400.

Judgment, Mr. Commissioner GOODEVE:

I think Order No. 21400, by closing one crossing and making the other at right angles, has greatly improved the safety of the public. I therefore agree with Commissioner McLean.

COMPLAINT OF THE VILLAGE OF FERGUS, ONTARIO, AGAINST THE INCREASED CHARGE FOR SWITCHING CARS MADE BY THE GRAND TRUNK RAILWAY COMPANY OF CANADA TO AND FROM THE INDUSTRIAL SPUR OR BRANCH LINE IN THE VILLAGE OF FERGUS, ONTARIO.

Oral judgment delivered by Assistant Chief Commissioner SCOTT at the close of the hearing, Toronto, July 3, 1914:

An agreement was made between the Grand Trunk Railway Company and the Corporation of the village of Fergus, dated the 3rd of December, 1913, giving certain privileges to the railway company on certain conditions. One of the conditions in the agreement was that the interswitching at Fergus should be done for a charge of $3 a car.

That condition of the agreement was complied with by the Grand Trunk until March last, when, for some reason, they started to follow the General Interswitching Order of the Board. That is Order No. 4988 of the 8th of July, 1908.

The opinion of the Board is that the agreement should govern the particular conditions at Fergus. It was not the intention of the Board in passing the General Order to make it apply to a case of this kind which had been specially provided for in an agreement. The Board has already decided that, where the special circumstances warranted, as at London, a special order relating to interswitching should remain in effect and that the general order should not apply.

This is a somewhat analagous case, except that this is even stronger, because this is the case of an agreement, and we are of the opinion that this $3 charge was a condition in the agreement which binds the railway company.

Is it your desire, Mr. Guthrie, that an order should go declaring that the $3 rate is effective during the continuation of this agreement? Or is this intimation of the Board sufficient?

Mr. GUTHRIE: I think an order should go to that effect.

The ASSISTANT CHIEF COMMISSIONER: The order would be during the life of the agreement. If the Grand Trunk exercises its right under Clause 8 and cancels the agreement, then the General Order would become effective.

Mr. CHISHOLM: I suppose if the Board is going to give an order in that direction, that probably the proper order would be just to cancel the tariff that we have made there. It may not be objectionable under certain circumstances; but I think it is not usual for the Board to make a declaratory order.

The ASSISTANT CHIEF COMMISSIONER: Yes. Well, we will issue an order cancelling that rate.

APPLICATION BY A RAILWAY COMPANY UNDER THE JURISDICTION OF THE BOARD, REQUESTING THE BOARD TO TAKE ACTION AGAINST A CONDUCTOR OF THE RAILWAY COMPANY.

Judgment, Chief Commissioner DRAYTON, July 4, 1914:

In the matter of A B, an application has been made by a railway company under the jurisdiction of the board, requesting the board to take action against a conductor of the railway company.

It appears that the conductor has been in the habit of refusing to give farmers and others empty cars in which to load their produce or merchandise, unless the applicant pays either directly or, as alleged, through the agent of a local lumber company, a sum of money usually amounting to $5 per car, although in some instances less.

The company relies on the provisions of the Railway Act in making its request, and in particular on the following section (317):—

"3. No company shall.—

"(*a*) Make or give any undue or unreasonable preference or advantage to, or in favour of any particular person or company, or any particular description of traffic, in any respect whatsoever;

"(*b*) by any unreasonable delay or otherwise howsoever, make any difference in treatment in the receiving, loading, forwarding, unloading, or delivery of the goods of a similar character in favour of or against any particular person, or company;

"(*c*) subject any particular person, or company, or any particular description of traffic, to any undue or unreasonable prejudice or disadvantage in any respect whatsoever;

"427. Any company, or any director or officer thereof, or any receiver, trustee, lessee, agent, or person, acting for or employed by such company, that does, causes or permits to be done, any matter, act or thing contrary to the provisions of this or the Special Act, or to the orders or directions of the Governor in Council, or of the minister, or of the board, made under this Act, or omits to do any matter, act or thing, thereby required to be done on the part of any such company, or person, shall, if no other penalty is provided in this or the Special Act for any such act or omission, be liable for each such offence to a penalty of not less than twenty dollars, and not more than five thousand dollars, in the discretion of the court before which the same is recoverable.

"2. Such company, director, officer, receiver, trustee, lessee, agent, or person shall also, in any case, in addition to any such penalty, be liable to any person injured by any such act or omission for the full amount of damages sustained thereby.

"431.

"3. Whenever the board shall have reasonable ground for belief that any company, or any person or corporation is violating or has violated any of the provisions of this Act, in respect of which violation a penalty may be imposed under this Act, the board may request the Attorney-General of Canada to institute and prosecute proceedings, on behalf of His Majesty, against such company or person for the imposition and recovery of the penalty provided under this Act for such violation, or the board may cause an information to be filed in the name of the Attorney-General of Canada for the imposition and recovery of such penalty."

The company claims that action by the board would have greater effect on other employees of the company than if proceedings were commenced and carried on by the railway company; and that, if the company itself took proceedings, all other conductors would stand together and make a personal fight against the railway company; while, if proceedings were taken by the board or the Attorney General, this ill-feeling would not be engendered.

The sections relied on by the company in support of the application undoubtedly can, in form, be said to cover the case of a conductor or other subordinate employee of the company; and, if no other remedy existed, it might possibly be the duty of the board, proceeding in the public interest, to take the action requested by the railway company.

It seems to me, however, that the sections are very much more applicable to proceedings against the company or its executive officers than against subordinate employees; and it is not in the best interests of railway administration for the board to interfere with proper disciplining by the company of employees at fault. Generally speaking, that is a matter entirely for the companies. If the board attempts to discipline the companies' employees in one case, there is no reason why it should not in others—with the result that the responsibility for disciplining railway employees would in part be removed from the companies (where it properly belongs) and be

placed upon the board. I think the board should not interfere, unless where it considers that there has been a failure on the part of a company to administer such discipline as the public safety demands.

The fraud complained of is, however, a particularly contemptible one. The farmers should and must be protected from such practices—practices which can and should, I think, be treated as criminal offences.

In my view, the remedy for the evil is easy. A very much better result, and one which will insure protection to shippers, can be obtained by the adoption of criminal proceedings under the provisions of the Act passed to prevent the payment or acceptance of illicit or secret commissions, and other like practices (8-9 Ed. VII, chap. 33). Section 3 and subsection (*a*) of this Act provide as follows:—

> "3. Every one is guilty of an offence and liable, upon conviction on indictment, to two years' imprisonment, or to a fine not exceeding two thousand five hundred dollars, or to both, and, upon summary conviction, to imprisonment for six months, with or without hard labour, or to a fine not exceeding one hundred dollars, or to both, who,—
>
> (*a*) being an agent, corruptly accepts or obtains, or agrees to accept or attempts to obtain, from any person, for himself or for any other person, any gift or consideration as an inducement or reward for doing or forbearing to do, or for having after the passing of this Act done or forborne to do, any act relating to his principal's affairs or business, or for showing or forbearing to show favour or disfavour to any person with relation to his principal's affairs or business."

The administration and enforcement of this Act lies in the hands of the local Crown Attorney, subject, of course, to the direction of his Attorney General; and the particulars of the present case will, in the public interest, be placed in the hands of the proper Crown authorities.

Concurred in by Assistant Chief Commissioner Scott.

STANDARD RAILWAY FENCES.

Judgment, Chief Commissioner DRAYTON, July 4, 1914:

The engineering department has drawn to the board's attention the fact that the different railway companies use different fences. For example, the Grand Trunk Pacific uses a five-wire fence with a board on top; the Grand Trunk Railway Company uses a ten-wire fence; the Canadian Pacific uses a five-wire fence to stop cattle and horses only, and a seven-wire fence on smooth or level ground with the bottom wire six inches from the ground; while the Canadian Northern uses a seven-wire fence.

The question of the adoption of a standard fence was brought to the attention of the railway companies during the recent western trip of the board. No representations have, however, been filed by the railway companies.

I am of the opinion that it is inadvisable for the board to prescribe any standard fence. The statutory obligation of the company to my mind form sufficient protection to the public. The obligation thrown on the railway companies is to provide such a fence as will be sufficient to prevent cattle and other animals from getting on the railway. This includes (with the exception, of course, of poultry), all the farmers' stock. If the board were to order the adoption of any particular standard, it might well be that, in some instances, that standard would not be sufficient, and in others would be unduly onerous.

Leaving the matter as the statute leaves it, the responsibility of the railway company in each case is clear—the fences must be sufficient to stop live stock from getting on the railway track.

Assistant Chief Commissioner Scott and Commissioners McLean and Goodeve concurred.

SESSIONAL PAPER No. 20c

Re C. L. O. & W. BUSINESS SPUR, TRENTON, ONTARIO.

Judgment, Assistant Chief Commissioner SCOTT, July 8, 1914:

There have been several hearings before the board with reference to the business spur which the Campbellford, Lake Ontario and Western Railway Company desire to construct at Trenton; and, some of the commissioners—including myself—have been at Trenton and walked over the ground.

Originally the railway company desired to have its spur come off the southern side of its main line and run in a south easterly direction down Ontario street; and, an agreement was made with the municipality whereby the latter were to close certain streets to facilitate the construction of that spur; but, upon investigation we found that the spur would run through the property of the Canada Creosoting Company and so destroy the plant of that concern as to practically put it out of business.

It was then arranged that the spur was to leave the main line on the north side and run around in a semicircle passing underneath the main line and down Ontario street as shown on the plans now before us for approval. This new line would necessitate the closing of a great number of streets—only a few of which are open, and a number of which I am satisfied never would be open.

The board recently issued Order No. 22058 of the 25th June last approving of the crossings of all these highways whether they are open or not. The railway company came before us at the Toronto sittings and stated that it would not go on with this spur unless arrangements were made for the closing of a number of the highway crossings so as to reduce the cost of construction and minimize the chances of accidents at highway crossings after the line was opened for traffic. Notwithstanding the fact that the town will be greatly benefited by the construction of this business spur, and had already agreed with the railway company to close certain streets, had the spur as originally located been approved by the board, it now takes the stand that it will not consent to the closing of any streets unless it is protected from claims of owners of adjoining lands. I do not think such claims, if any, could amount to much, as most of the streets are not now open and the territory is undeveloped and unoccupied.

In order to help this matter along, I think the board might intervene and decide that certain highways were to be diverted so as to allow for the closing of a number of the highway crossings.

I therefore think an order may go repealing the order of the 27th June last—No. 22058—and providing for level crossings of the proposed spur from the point where it leaves the main line to the point where it passes underneath the main line over Marmora street; and, from Sophia street at the two points where the spur crosses that street. Then the following highways should be closed and diverted: Bocage crossing should be closed and the street diverted into Sophia street; Eugenia crossing should be closed and the street diverted into Louisa street; Louisa street should be closed and a diversion made into Sophia street; Elizabeth street should be closed at both points where it is crossed by the spur and the diversion be made into Marmora street; and Leopold street crossing should be closed, and diverted by way of Elizabeth street into Marmora street. These street crossings will, I think, amply serve the territory affected. It provides for Marmora street running through at right angles to the main line. It is now open and has a subway underneath the main line; and the two crossings of Sophia street being left open will provide for a through highway parallel to the main line.

There should be a condition attached to the closing and diverting of these highways, that the land owners of adjoining property should be compensated for damage, if any, that they may suffer because of such closing. We have no power to put any of that on the municipality, and therefore the damages, if any, would have to be paid by the Canadian Pacific Railway Company. I do think, however, that in view of the agreement the municipality entered into with the railway company, that the municipality might well assist the railway company to some extent in this matter.

I think an order should go as I have suggested.

Commissioner McLean concurred.

No proceedings having been taken by the railway company, order issued rescinding Orders Nos. 22058 and 22234; and authorizing the applicant company to construct, maintain, and operate its Trenton business spur across certain streets in the town of Trenton: owners of adjoining property to be compensated for the damage, if any, which they may suffer by reason of the closing of some of the streets.

MASSEY-HARRIS COMPANY, ET AL, V. CANADIAN NORTHERN AND GRAND TRUNK PACIFIC RAILWAY COMPANIES.

Judgment, Chief Commissioner DRAYTON, July 8, 1914:

This is an application made by the Massey-Harris Company, The Edmonton City Dairy, Limited, Knight and Forst, The Standard Plumbing and Heating Company, Limited, and Andrew Lee, for an order requiring either the Canadian Northern or the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway Company, under the provisions of section 226 of the Railway Act, to provide and construct suitable spur tracks from the companies' main line, in the city of Edmonton, along the lane in blocks 5 and 6, Hudson Bay reserve, as far as Athabaska avenue.

The aplication is one which brings into question railway facilities for what is termed the industrial area lying to the west of First street and south of McKenzie avenue.

The area affected by the principle on which the present application will be dealt with extends from Tenth street to First avenue, the Canadian Pacific's freight sheds and yards being situate on the block between Tenth and Eleventh streets.

The district has been in part supplied with industrial spurs there being spurs on the north parts of blocks 7, 8 and 9 to the west, and, according to the plan submitted, spurs are built to accommodate blocks 3 and 4 to the east.

The application has been heard more than once, although there was no occasion for its being listed the second time; but as the directions of the board apparently were not understood, it is advisable to again deal with the matter.

The applicants desire that the spurs should run directly down the lanes and without cutting through any lands on the sub-divisions.

The railway companies opposed the application on the grounds that the traffic had assumed such proportions that the existing freight sheds were insufficient; and that, with a view of increasing local facilities, it was necessary to build new sheds running from the lane on block 7 to a point east of the lane on block 4. The effect of this construction would, of course, prevent spurs being run off the Canadian Northern's track as was done in the case of the spurs constructed in blocks 7, 8 and 9.

The district is a district which, as already intimated by the board at a former hearing, should get the benefit of industrial spurs. The construction of these spurs, indeed, is necessary for the proper development of the district. Without them, the whole scheme of development of the district must fail—at least to a large extent.

The board's engineers have made a special study of the situation with a view of getting trackage to the properties interested in such a manner as to involve as small an occupation of private property as possible. The results obtained are shown on the plans on file with the board, a blue print of which is attached hereto and will be sent to each of the parties.

As already intimated, this construction may be had. The different parties applying are entitled to get it; but, as before stated, they are only entitled to get it on providing a right-of-way free of cost to whichever company may be elected to do the work.

It was pointed out to the property owners that their interests were entirely common, and that, under such circumstances, it should not be very difficult to bring about such an arrangement of the local interests as would enable construction to proceed.

The construction is entirely for the benefit of the property owners. The railway companies not only do not want it, but oppose the application; and if the property owners still desire to obtain the spurs, an order will go for the work just as soon as the right-of-way is provided; or in case the property owners find that they cannot obtain the right-of-way by agreement, just so soon as they pay into court a sum of money which the Engineer of the Board will certify as necessary to enable the railway company to obtain it under expropriation proceedings.

Commissioner Goodeve concurred.

Re CERTAIN FARM CROSSINGS.

Judgment, Mr. Commissioner McLEAN, July 8, 1914:

Application is made for an order directing the Canadian Pacific railway to reopen farm crossings on the properties of Mrs. Adam Hillhouse, E. Hume, and E. I. Booth. The farms in question are located in the province of Quebec, near Foster Station, where the Canadian Pacific branch line to Knowlton joins the main line from St. John.

The farm crossings in question, which date back to the construction of that portion of the Canadian Pacific system which was built under the charter of the Atlantic and North West railway, were closed by the Canadian Pacific on January 8, 1914. The railway claims to be within its rights in so acting, as it states that in each instance the property is owned by different parties on each side of the railway.

Under Section 252 of the Railway Act, every railway is required to make crossings "for persons across whose lands the railway is carried, convenient and proper for the crossing of the railway for farm purposes." This obligation, however, came into the Railway Act only in 1888. Prior to that date, there was no right to a farm crossing unless it was specifically covered in the conveyance from the landowner to the railway. The railway in question was built at a time when the law was as above set out. The question of the rights, if any, of the present landowners to a reservation of the farm crossings as a matter of right relates itself to the reservations made at the time of the construction of the railway. It is stated that there were reservations as to farm crossings, and that these crossings were long enjoyed.

There have been a considerable number of transfers in connection with the properties in question. It is not necessary to trace the chain of title from the time the railway was constructed. There have been placed before the board copies of the deeds from Charles H. Young to Adam Hillhouse, dated respectively, November 27, 1891, and May 21, 1894. In neither of these deeds is there a reservation as to a right of crossing over the railway. In the deed from Gitty to Booth, dated January 8, 1913, there is no reservation of a crossing. Whatever be the effect of reservation, it is sufficient to say, at this juncture, that in the absence of words bearing explicitly on it, it cannot be assumed to exist simply because a predecessor in title enjoyed such a right of crossing.

In *Midland Railway Co. v. Gribble, 2 Ch. Div., pp. 129 and 827,* there was considered a state of facts which bears on the present application in so far as the two cases above referred to are concerned. Under Section 68 of the Railway Clauses Act, 1845, provision was made *inter alia* that the company should make and maintain ".... passages over, under, or by the sides of .... the railway as shall be necessary for the purposes of making good any interruptions caused by the railway to the use of the lands through which the railway shall be made." Here there was, in contradistinction from the situation in Canada prior to 1888, a statutory obligation as to farm crossings. In the case in question, the situation was that a line of railway was built through the land of one Raynsford, and in pursuance of the provision in the Railway Clauses Act, already referred to, a level crossing was provided. The conveyance to the company

reserved a right of way over it to Raynsford and his successors in title, and the company covenanted to maintain it. Afterwards Raynsford sold and conveyed his land on one side of the railway to one Plowman, not mentioning the crossing and not giving Plowman any right of way over the land retained, nor reserving any right of way over the land sold. Afterwards the land retained by Raynsford was sold to Gribble, who insisted on his right to use the crossing. It was held by the Court of Appeal that the right to the crossing was finally abandoned by the conveyance to Plowman; that there was no right thereafter to use the crossing; and that the company was at liberty to stop it.

The situation in regard to Edward Hume is different. Under date of November 17, 1902, Lucie Chamberlain, widow of the late Charles H. Young, conveyed to Edward Hume the property in connection with which the question as to the farm crossing is now raised. In this deed there was a specific reservation of "the right-of-way across that part of said lot fourteen hundred and three lying north of the Atlantic and Northwest Railway Company's right-of-way, owned by the said seller. . . . " The deed also recites the obligation of the purchaser in connection with this right-of-way "to keep up at all times and to keep shut a good and substantial gate at the place of exit, on the highway from the piece across which the right-of-way is hereby granted." That is to say, there was reserved to the purchaser an exit from the farm crossing in existence over the lands of the vendor to the highway.

In the course of the decision in *Midland Railway Co. v. Gribble,* Lindley, Lord Justice, used the following language referring to the conveyance from Raynsford to Plowman:—

> "He conveyed the land to Mr Plowman without granting him any right of way over the retained land and without reserving to himself any right-of-way over the land conveyed to Mr. Plowman; that is to say, he severed his land in such a way as to show conclusively that he never intended to use it thereafter. That appears to me to be a clear and distinct abandonment of his right of way over the railway."

From this language, it would appear that if Raynsford had reserved a right of way to Plowman, or had reserved a right of way across the land conveyed to Plowman, a different conclusion would have been arrived at.

In *Toronto, Hamilton & Buffalo R. W. Co. v. Simpson Brick Co.* 17 O. L. R., 632, a set of facts was dealt with which appears to be especially pertinent to Hume's case. When the railway was built, it traversed a piece of land which was the property of Noah S. Briggs and Charles S. Briggs as tenants in common. Simultaneously with the conveyance of the right of way through their property to the railway, they obtained an agreement from the railway for the construction of a farm crossing. Subsequently both properties were acquired by Maguire. Later, Maguire conveyed to Fanning the portion of the property north of the railway, granting him at the same time a right of way by way of exit to a highway over the land which the vendor owned south of the railway. Because of the facts which have thus been set out, it was held that there was no such severance as would involve the cessor of the right of crossing. It was pointed out in the decision that while in *Midland R. W. Co. v. Gribble* there had been no reservation in the present case " . . . . there was the grant by Maguire to Fanning, as appurtenant to the land to the north which Fanning bought, of the right of way over the strip 30 feet wide leading from the railway crossing over Maguire's unsold land to Aberdeen avenue."

In Hume's case, I am of opinion that there is a legal right to the continuance of the farm crossing, and that it should forthwith be re-established.

As to the cases of Mrs. Hillhouse and Booth, no such legal right appears. The board is advised by its inspector that it is necessary that these parties should have farm crossings, if they are properly to enjoy their properties. Under these conditions, an

order should, I think, go, under section 253, as a matter of grace, the cost being on the applicants.

Concurred in by Assistant Chief Commissioner Scott.

INDEPENDENT TELEPHONE CO. *vs.* BELL TELEPHONE CO.

Judgment, Mr. Commissioner McLean, July 16, 1914:

By subsection 5 of section 4, 7-8 Edward VII, chap. 61, the board is empowered in such an application as is before us to make an order "upon such terms as to compensation as the board deems just and expedient." In section 5 of the Act, there are set out the sections of the Railway Act which apply in respect of telephone companies subject to the board's jurisdiction. It is recognized that in so far as telephonic communication is referred to, these sections may not in their entirety be applicable, for section 5 contains the qualifying words that these sections "in so far as reasonably applicable and not inconsistent with this part or the Special Act shall apply to the jurisdiction of the board and the exercise thereof . . . ."

The subject matter of subsection 5, so far as the present application is concerned, falls within the condition where there is an application by a company, province, municipality, or corporation not subject to the jurisdiction of the board—such applicant having authority to construct or operate a telephone system or line—to obtain a long distance connection with a telephone company subject to the board's jurisdiction. Since the scope of the board's jurisdiction, under the provisions of the Railway Act already referred to, is concerned with companies over which it has jurisdiction, it follows that under subsection 5 there arises a case where the sections in question are not applicable. Under such conditions, the board must find the measure of its power as well as of its responsibility in the subsections which specifically deal with an application such as the present.

The word "compensation" has been defined as—

> "A recompense or reward for some loss, injury, or service, especially when it is given by statute."

American and English Cyclopedia of Law, vol. 6, 369. When used in a technical sense, the word "compensation" is concerned with damages. But it may have a wider significance, depending on the context.

The word as used in subsection 5 appears to me to have a very wide significance. It is true that the subsection recites—

> "and the board may order the company to provide for such use, connection or communication, upon such terms as to compensation as the board deems just and expedient . . . ."

Those words by themselves might seem to imply that the compensation was "for such use, connection or communication." But if this construction was intended, then the use of the word "just," in connection with the terms to be fixed, would have been sufficient to define the scope of the board's power. The addition of the word "expedient" imports a wider discretion on the part of the board.

The latter part of subsection 5, which provides that the board "may order and direct how, when, where, and by whom, and upon what terms and conditions such use, connection, or communication shall be had, constructed, installed, operated, and maintained," is concerned with the physical conditions. Subsection 6, in dealing with standards of apparatus, provides that the board—

> ". . . . shall only grant the leave applied for in case and in so far as, in view of such standards, the use, connection, or communication applied for can, in the opinion of the board, be made or exercised satisfactorily and without undue or unreasonable injury to or interference with the telephone business of the company"

In any relief granted under a general order, the board has to be satisfied in each case that the provisions of the above subsection are complied with.

But the "injury" or "interference" herein referred to is an injury or interference with the company's business which may arise if improper appliances are used by the connecting company, thereby impeding the forwarding of telephonic communication and slowing up the business. That is to say, the injury or interference is physical. It is not concerned with any loss of business to the company subject to the board's jurisdiction, such loss being attributable to the fact that there has been an invasion by the independent company of a field hitherto occupied by the company subject to the board's jurisdiction, i.e. the Bell Company.

While subsection 6 is primarily concerned with the standards of apparatus and physical conditions to be considered, the opening words of the subsection are significant:—

> "Upon any such application, the Board shall, in addition to any other consideration affecting the case.....''

That is to say, under this subsection the board is under obligation to consider not only the factors concerned with physical conditions and standards of apparatus, but also all other considerations affecting the case. The physical conditions to be considered are defined. The scope of the other factors to be considered is left to the discretion of the Board.

As I read the sections, there is no question but that the word "compensation" as used in subsection 5 of section 4 has a wide significance, embracing not only payment for service but also compensation for loss. The obvious intention of the sections concerned is that in a field where the analogies to railway transportation are recognized by Parliament as imperfect, the board should have a wide discretion as to the factors to be considered in striking the compensation. In so striking the compensation, it is open to it to consider not only the compensation for service in connection with the long distance connection but also the effect of such connection upon the local service of the Bell Company. That the effect upon the local service of the Bell Company should be considered is, so far as the board is concerned, *res adjudicata*. It is true that the judgment of the late Chief Commissioner of May 10, 1911, which was implemented by the provisional order, was concerned with a limited period of time and a limited number of companies. But the limitation does not extend to the principle set out in his judgment, approved by a full section of the board; and which has not been overruled by the board.

In the annual payment made by each of the Bell Company subscribers, there is in reality included some contribution not only to the initial cost but also to the maintenance costs of the Bell long distance equipment. The Bell subscriber has, of course, when using the long distance lines to pay the long distance toll, whether he makes a call from his own house or place of business, or from a public pay station. But having the telephone either in his home or place of business renders him the convenience of being able to call up there as well as to be called there. In the Bell annual local service charge no particular part of the charge is earmarked for the long distance service; although the long distance is part of the general service which all the earnings assist in maintaining. Nor is it possible to differentiate in this respect between the one who uses long distance frequently and the one who seldom or never uses it. There is a flat annual local service charge.

It has already been indicated that the late Chief Commissioner Mabee held that interference with the business of the Bell Telephone Company was one factor to be considered. Without attempting to exhaust the factors which are worthy of consideration, those especially pertinent and additional to the one referred to by the late chief commissioner may be set out and dealt with analytically.

1. *The contribution towards initial and maintenance costs* which is contained in the annual payment of the Bell Telephone subscriber is a factor which is peculiar to the Bell subscriber and is not properly allocatable to the user of the independent telephone who may for the time being be using the Bell long distance equipment. In the case of the Bell subscriber there is a question of joint costs, some contribution to long distance costs being made by an actual user of local telephone service who is also an actual or a potential user of long distance service.

2. *The factor of convenience already referred to.*—This factor of convenience is one which is common both to the Bell subscriber and to the subscriber of the Independent company, who uses or may desire to use the long distance equipment of the Bell Company. A payment from the Independent company is justifiable as covering this factor. From the standpoint of accounting, it appears to be more satisfactory to cover it in a blanket rate, rather than in a charge allocated to each subscriber of the Independent company. Some of these subscribers may use long distance quite frequently; others not at all. But it does not appear feasible to treat the company other than as a unit.

3. *The service given.*—Here there is concerned a facility arising from the use of the long distance equipment which is more expensive in point, not only of initial cost but also of maintenance, than the ordinary local telephone equipment. There is given, when a connection is afforded, not only the use of an expensive facility, with the switching costs attaching to such business, but there is also given the facility of a wide area of long distance telephonic communication. That is to say, there is involved here not only the cost of the service but also the value of the service. It must be recognized that the opportunities for use are reciprocal, and that in the special charge added under this heading the independent company should, therefore, receive a proportion of the special charge as well.

In the payment to be made, it is impossible, unfortunately, to work the matter out with scientific accuracy. Such a basis has been sought for by the board but its experience in this regard has coincided with the experience of other regulative tribunals as to the impossibility of obtaining an exact basis. The board has before it experience tables of the companies covered by the provisional order. The rates to be struck may justifiably be such, as bearing this experience in mind, appear just and reasonable.

The payment to be made should be made up of two factors:—

First, there should be a company payment by way of compensation for loss to the Bell company, as well as for the factor of convenience to the independent subscriber, the significance of this having already been set out. The payment under this heading should be a flat payment per year, graded as follows:—

(1) Companies having not exceeding 250 subscribers, $100.

(2) Companies having exceeding 250 subscribers and not exceeding 600 subscribers, $200.

(3) Companies having exceeding 600 subscribers, $300.

Second, there should be a payment for service in connection with the additional facility given. Here a special charge of 10 cents each way in addition to the Bell long distance charge would appear, from the experience tables, to be reasonable. Of this charge, the Bell company should in each case receive 7 cents and the independent company 3 cents.

Concurred in by Assistant Chief Commissioner Scott and Commissioner Goodeve.

Reported in 17 Can. Ry. Cas., 266.

APPLICATION OF THE CITY OF CALGARY, ALBERTA, FOR A SPUR AT MILE 2·5, RED DEER SUBDIVISION, C.P.R.

Judgment, Chief Commissioner Drayton, July 18, 1914:

This application was heard at a sitting of the board held at Calgary on June 22, 1914. It was objected to by the railway company in the first instance because the

switch, if constructed, would be situated about eight-tenths of a mile from an expensive system of signals, which the company had put in to protect switching operations, and, in the next instance, because the company had recently expended a large sum of money to provide trackage to another industrial subdivision in the southern part of Calgary.

It appears that the city owns twenty-six acres of an industrial subdivision which would be served—at least in part—by the spur track now applied for; that the corporation has already signed the usual spur agreement under which it has agreed to pay the cost of the labour and ties and pay annually 7 per cent interest on the cost of the rails; that believing that an agreement would be made it has already sold one portion of the subdivision to a company, already manufacturing upon the understanding that it would get a spur track; and that that company hauls three cars of material a day in, and sends one car out. The industrial company in its communication on file represents that during the first year it will have from 750 to 1,000 cars to unload on the spur, and outbound from 150 to 200 cars, and that this will be increased gradually; that the capital of the company is $100,000, and that it is expected the factory will be developed to employ about one hundred men.

No judgment was given at the hearing, as the board desired further information on the question of cost, protection and safety.

An engineer of the board has since reported on the matter. In this report the cost of the spur is shown to be $2,507.13. Of this amount, under the proposed agreement, $1,880 would be paid by the applicant, while $627.13 represents the cost of the rails, fastenings and turn-outs, on which an annual rental of 7 per cent would be paid by the applicant to the railway company.

The engineer further reports that the automatic signals now installed north of Bridge 15, should be extended in order to protect the proposed spur, if constructed; that the cost would be about $2,800; and that, in his opinion this cost should be borne by the city.

Dealing with the railway company's objections, I do not think the fact that it has spent a large sum of money in providing trackage facilities to the south is any answer under the Act to a *bona fide* application under section 226. I find the present application to be *bona fide*, and I find that the industry now in occupation of part of the industrial site in question is established under such circumstances as to render necessary the construction of the spur in the interest of trade as contemplated by section 226 of the Railway Act, unless it is inadvisable in the interest of public safety to authorize such construction. Considering this matter, the railway company's other objection arises. The signalling device which the railway company has installed for the purpose of protecting switching movements in the terminal were properly installed by the railway company in the interest of public safety. The installation was sufficient for the company's purposes and for the public safety. What was necessary in the area protected and which has been properly adopted by the company should be extended so as to cover operations on the proposed switch and on the company's lines adjacent thereto. This construction is only necessary for the purpose of enabling the city to carry on the development of its new industrial site.

I am therefore of the opinion that the automatic signals now installed north of Bridge 15 must be extended to protect the spur now proposed, and that the cost of this extension should be borne by the only party benefited that is, the city.

This switch should now be so laid as to accommodate other industries which may from time to time be located in the city's industrial subdivision, and no one or more industries should be allowed to obtain exclusive rights to that switch. This is a matter which the city can easily provide for, as the switch when constructed, although a switch not to be operated by the city as such, will be on city property.

The parties will be advised at once of this disposition of the matter, and an opportunity given them to submit a substituted plan should it appear that the construction

now proposed is not such as to serve the whole of the site. By this I do not mean that the construction as now made should be sufficient to serve the whole site. What I desire the parties to understand is that the track should be laid at such an angle and such a position that it may be extended from time to time and laterals from time to time run into it, so as to obviate another break in the railway Company's line.

Commissioner Goodeve concurred.

Order in accordance with judgment issued.

RE ENTWISTLE, ALTA.

Judgment, Chief Commissioner DRAYTON, July 18, 1914:

Many letters have been received from property owners interested in maintaining the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway station where it is, pointing out that property has been purchased entirely on the situation of the station and that its removal would greatly injure, and in many cases ruin those who purchased property in the original town site, or representations to that effect.

I think the result to the owners in the neighbourhood of the present station from a change of the station site would not be nearly so serious as is feared.

After, however going very carefully again, and for the last time, into the whole question, I am of the opinion that it is now impossible for the board to change the station site.

It is unnecessary to go over the grounds already so often gone over and which appear in the different judgments of the board, commencing indeed before my appointment to the board.

The standard conditions of public safety required, having regard to the high and long bridge adjoining Entwistle must be observed, not only on the one side of the river, but also on the other. The board's engineers will have to see that all the requirements laid down by their reports as necessary to be observed on the east must also be observed on the west.

I am, however, of the opinion that while these requirements prevent the construction of a station on the site near the bridge asked for by the original settlement of Entwistle, a spur track with a trailing point switch toward King street, and which should obviate any question of danger in so far as a derailment on a movement toward the bridge is concerned, can be constructed. The board's chief operating officer has made a careful survey of the whole situation. He recommends that the spur track now located between King street and Pembina bridge be removed, and that a spur track capable of holding five cars be installed at a point east of King street, with a trailing point switch towards King street, the same to be constructed with a descending grade away from the main line so that there would be no danger of cars running out or fouling the main track; and that the railway company arrange to handle carload freight for the village of Entwistle and those that require it at this point. The safe and proper location for the construction of the spur is shown by the red ink line on the plan on file with the board.

The owners of property on the river bank have complained bitterly as to their present facilities. It is no real hardship to have to go a distance of a mile and a half to a station. Distances far greater than this have to be travelled in the centres of dense population. On the other hand, the road which the railway company constructed under the board's order, while originally, apparently well constructed, is a difficult road over which to team.

I think that the order now made is proper, having regard to the difficulties that Entwistle is now at in obtaining its supplies. It may well be that under ordinary circumstances there is not enough business to warrant, under ordinary conditions, the

construction of a siding at this point; but under the present circumstances I am clearly of the opinion that the construction is proper and necessary.

Commissioner Goodeve concurred.

Order in accordance with judgment issued.

COMPLAINT OF J. W. LEHNHART OF MAZENOD, SASK., AS TO MOVEMENT OF A CARLOAD OF MACHINERY FROM REGINA TO MAZENOD.

Judgment, Chief Commissioner DRAYTON, July 20, 1914:

Mazenod is a station on the Canadian Northern line, and is the point to which construction has been carried on the branch of that company from Avonlea to Gravelbourg.

Owing to the fact that the Canadian Northern has not as yet in operation any line from Regina to Moosejaw which would enable the car to have been taken the appropriate route making connection at Moosejaw with the Canadian Northern line to the south, this car was routed *via* Maryfield, Radville, and Avonlea to Mazenod, a most circuitous route, making a movement of 401 miles.

For a movement of this length the rate on this material is 44 cents, and on the weight moved as given by the complainant of 49,800 pounds the total charge would be $219.12. The complainant shows that the sum charged was $216.63.

For this roundabout movement, therefore, no overcharge has been made.

The Canadian Northern has omitted to give a town tariff from Regina to Mazenod, although it is within Regina's distributing radius, and although the company has covered that point in its town tariffs from Port Arthur, Winnipeg, Portage la Prairie, and Brandon.

The Canadian Northern has also included in the Regina town tariff Avonlea and other points on the Moosejaw-Radville line. It has also covered the branch from Radville to Bengough. This is a branch running some fifty miles south of the Avonlea-Gravelbourg branch on which Mazenod is situate, and is, therefore, that distance further removed from Regina.

The answer made by Mr. Shaw to the inquiry of the board's chief traffic officer as to why that company had discriminated against Regina merchants by omitting to throw open the Gravelbourg branch to them, states that the company has no direct route from Regina to points on the Gravelbourg branch and has no connection with the Canadian Pacific at Moosejaw which would permit of a reasonable rate arrangement.

The same answer might well have been given as to the branch from Radville to Bengough.

I am of the opinion that a discrimination both undue and unjust is worked by the present state of affairs; and that in order to remove such discrimination, the Canadian Northern should be directed to extend the Regina distributing rates along the Gravelbourg branch westerly from Avonlea. The result would be that, on the particular movement in question, the rate would be 37 cents instead of 44 cents, and the total charge $184.26.

This board has no authority to order rebates or the direction would now be made ordering a refund of the difference between $184.26 and $216.63. Just so soon as the Canadian Northern construction is completed from Regina to Moosejaw so as to give connection with the Canadian Northern line south from Moosejaw, much more favourable rates, of course, will be enjoyed by these districts.

Concurred in by Commissioner Goodeve.

Reported in 17 Can. Ry Cas. 93.

SESSIONAL PAPER No. 20c

COMPLAINT OF SMART-WOODS, LIMITED, OF WINNIPEG, MAN., THAT THE DELIVERING CARRIERS AT WINNIPEG DISCLAIM RESPONSIBILITY FOR THE SHORTAGE OF GOODS RECEIVED BY THEM "SHORT" FROM THEIR CONNECTIONS, ALTHOUGH THEY ARE WILLING TO ASSIST IN OBTAINING REDRESS FROM THE DEFAULTING CARRIER.

Judgment, Chief Commissioner DRAYTON, July 20, 1914.

The complaint was heard at the sittings of the board at Winnipeg on May 26, 1914.

Complainant's goods (burlaps) came from India, via Boston, Mass., and, being consigned "to order", the bills of lading, properly endorsed, have to be given up to the delivering carrier by the consignees as their proof of ownership. This rule obtains everywhere, and is, of course, a proper one, since the last carrier, for the time being, holds the goods in trust for the shipper or the bank; but because the bill of lading has to be so surrendered is no reason, as the complainants contend it is, why the onus of the delivering carrier, with respect to short deliveries, should be greater than in the case of straight consignments.

Over-seas importations may be covered by a joint ocean and rail bill of lading, containing the conditions of carriage appertaining to water and land respectively, or by a ship's bill of lading containing the ocean conditions only. As a rule, the latter terminates at the seaport on this side, in which case the initial railway company issues, or is supposed to issue, an inland or rail bill of lading—the American Uniform Bill of Lading from United States ports, and that prescribed by this board from Canadian ports. In some cases the local ocean or ship's bill of lading is, in effect, made a through one by showing the inland destination and the through rate thereto, notwithstanding that it does not contain the conditions of carriage by rail. Those filed by the complainants with the board in this case are on ship's bill of lading forms.

The main question is the responsibility of the several rail carriers, as this board has —as I pointed out at the hearing—no jurisdiction over the steamship companies; and I think the conditions of rail carriage settle it. As regards carriage from a Canadian seaport, section 2 of the Board's Order No. 7562, dated the 15th day of July, 1909, is as follows:—

> Section 2.—"In the case of shipments from one point in Canada to another point in Canada, or where goods are shipped under a joint tariff, the carrier issuing this bill of lading, in addition to its other liability hereunder, shall be liable for any loss, damage, or injury to such goods from which the other carrier is not by the terms of this bill of lading relieved, caused by or resulting from the act, neglect, or default of any other carrier to which such goods may be delivered in Canada, or under such joint tariff, or over whose line or lines such goods may pass in Canada or under such joint tariff, the onus of proving that such loss was not so caused or did not so result being upon the carrier issuing this bill of lading. The carrier issuing this bill of lading shall be entitled to recover from the other carrier on whose line or lines the loss, damage, or injury to the said goods shall have been sustained the amount of such loss, damage, or injury as it may be required to pay hereunder, as may be evidenced by any receipt, judgment, or transcript thereof. Nothing in this section shall deprive the holder of this bill of lading or party entitled to the goods of any remedy or right of action which he may have against the carrier issuing this bill of lading or any other carrier."

Paragraph 4 of section 4 of the same order provides that:—

> "Notice of loss, damage or delay must be made in writing to the carrier at the point of delivery, or to the carrier at the point of origin, within four months after delivery of the goods, or in case of failure to make delivery, then within four months after a reasonable time for delivery has elapsed. Unless notice is so given the carrier shall not be liable." But it does not make the delivering carrier liable unless it be so *de facto*.

Section 2 of the conditions of the Uniform Bill of Lading approved by the Interstate Commerce Commission, which governs from Boston, is as follows:—

> "In issuing this bill of lading this company agrees to transport only over its own line, and except as otherwise provided by law acts only as agent with respect to the portion of the route beyond its own line.
>
> "No carrier shall be liable for loss, damage, or injury not occurring on its own road or its portion of the through route, nor after said property has been delivered to the next carrier, except as such liability is or may be imposed by law, but nothing contained in this bill of lading shall be deemed to exempt the initial carrier from any such liability so imposed."

And paragraph 3, of section 3 provides that:—

> "Claims for loss, damage, or delay must be made in writing to the carrier at the point of delivery or at the point of origin within four months after delivery of the property, or, in case of failure to make delivery, then within four months after a reasonable time for delivery has elapsed. Unless claims are so made the carrier shall not be liable."

Here, again, the board is without jurisdiction over the initial carrier at Boston.
I am of the opinion that the complaint should be dismissed.
Concurred in by Commissioner Goodeve.
Reported in 17 Can. Ry. Cas. 340.

RE ST. LOUIS, SASKATCHEWAN, SIDING.

Judgment, Chief Commissioner DRAYTON, July 20, 1914:

This is an application for an order directing the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway Company to construct a siding from its Prince Albert branch line at St. Louis, Saskatchewan. The railway company on being served with the application, submitted that its "line for some distance south of the Saskatchewan river is descending on a 1 per cent grade to make the crossing, and in traversing this country it is necessary to take heavy work. Hence the physical characteristics of the country make it impossible to locate a siding as desired by the petitioners. The company naturally would be pleased to place a siding at a location the inhabitants of the surrounding country desire, if the conditions would warrant it. In this case unfortunately they do not." The company also submitted that "not only is the grade against the siding, but also the short distance to the river, and this coupled with the extensive work that would be necessary makes such a proposition beyond our possibility of carrying out."

The case came on for hearing at the board's sitting in Saskatoon on May 28, 1914, when it was represented that St. Louis was an old settlement; that the roads converge at Duck Lake, going west, and Prince Albert, going north; that some sixteen business places are established in St. Louis; that the townsite is already laid out and people are ready to build buildings, in prospect being two elevators and a grist mill. It was also pointed out that the railway company had placed a siding some five or six miles farther south at a point described as New St. Louis; that that location was not suitable in that the roads do not converge there, and that there was a lack of water supply, while on the other hand a first-class spring as well as river water was available at St. Louis. It was also claimed that 201 persons lived in St. Louis, and that 27 buildings had actually been erected.

The railway company made no answer to these representations at this sitting, it being stated on behalf of the company that it had no interest in either the old or the new townsite, resting its objections to the application entirely on the engineering questions.

The case was adjourned in order to enable an assistant engineer of the board to make an inspection.

The assistant engineer has since reported, and states that he was accompanied by Senator Davis of Prince Albert, and was met in St. Louis by Mr. Sinclair of Sinclair & Co. and about twenty-five others who were interested in having the siding asked for constructed. He also states that when in Winnipeg he took the matter up with the railway company's divisional engineer, its assistant solicitor, and Mr. Rosevear who is its traffic officer.

The report shows that the railway company has located its siding at new St. Louis; that this point is, in his (the assistant engineer) opinion, a proper point for station grounds; that at New St. Louis there is a grain elevator, and that a hotel and a store are now being erected; that descending from new St. Louis to old St. Louis on the banks of the river there is a descending grade averaging one per cent to a point sixteen hundred feet from the banks of the Saskatchewan, which portion is on a level grade, part being on a five degree curve; that the distance from new St. Louis to old St. Louis is 3·75 miles; that at present the railway company has constructed a temporary siding about 600 feet from the banks of the river and running south parallel to the railway which will hold eight or nine cars, and is being used for material used in the construction of the bridge now being built. He estimates that the population of old St. Louis is about 140, and states that there are two general stores, two temporary implement firms and other stores that go to make a small town, but nothing very substantial in the way of buildings.

Other matters are referred to by the assistant engineer on which it is not necessary to dwell, the engineer reporting that in the interest of public safety and the proper operation of trains, the application should be refused.

The parties having received copies of the engineer's report, the case was again set down for hearing at the sitting of the board held in Regina, June 24, 1914.

The applicants still pressed for construction. Mr. Zeiger appeared and produced a petition largely signed by the settlers of the district, and pointed out that he represented not the townspeople of St. Louis but the farmers of the district and that probably for more than 30 years people have been residing there on the Saskatchewan river, and that there was an old ferry site where the road used to lead to Prince Albert just where the Grand Trunk are now putting this bridge across; that the roads to old St. Louis are good roads and that the settlement is much condensed along the river and that a siding could be well constructed on the 1,600 feet of level which extends back from the river. He further pointed out that there are practically no roads to new St. Louis at the present time from the east or the west, while the roads are already made to old St. Louis by reason of the fact that the old ferry road has been running from that point into Prince Albert for the last thirty years.

Judgment was reserved.

It may be noted that out of 76 signatures attached to the petition filed by Mr. Zeiger, only 13 of the petitioners appeared to be interested in old St. Louis, the remainder apparently being made up of farmers, the numbers of whose sections, townships and ranges are given.

Since the hearing, Senator Davis has written the board as follows:—

"PRINCE ALBERT, SASK., June 29, 1914.

"Mr. CARTWRIGHT,
Secretary Board of Railway Commissioners,
Ottawa, Ont.

"MY DEAR MR. CARTWRIGHT,—*Re* petitions that have been sent to the board and representations made to the commission sitting here, at Saskatoon and Regina, on the crossing of the Grand Trunk of the South Saskatchewan river at St. Louis, wherein some people claim that they should have a siding, I want to say in the interests of people who are living on the townsite as surveyed by the Grand Trunk three miles south of that point, that they have had no opportunity of being heard before the board and knew nothing of these petitions and

representations. They would like a chance if it is necessary, to be heard on this question, as they have a lot of money invested at that point. From information we have received these petitions are signed by people who are not interested at all in the matter. At the time the railroad was built or the grade built to the river there were no interests there at all, except one little store. The people that are in there since have come there with the intention of making money out of the bridge construction. They have no buildings of a permanent character and they have no rights to claim any siding because they came there knowing that there was no siding there. I would like before any decision is made by the board, that the people at Garson from the Grand Trunk townsite proper should be heard on this question, as they are vitally interested. All communications should be addressed to Mr. F. W. Halliday, Prince Albert, as secretary of the Townsite Company.

"Yours truly,

"(Sgd.) T. O. DAVIS."

Garson, the point referred to in Senator Davis' letter is the point which I have referred to as new St. Louis. This is the place where the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway Company has placed its station, and is the location of the new townsite. This new townsite, from the senator's letter, appears to be controlled by a townsite company of which Mr. F. W. Halliday, of Prince Albert, is secretary.

Nothing in this present application directly affects the new townsite, except the possibility that if St. Louis is left entirely without any railway facilities those resident there may be compelled to move to new St. Louis, or, on the other hand, lots in new St. Louis may be more readily sold to newcomers than they otherwise would be if the old settlement is to be continued, unless, indeed, the point selected for the new townsite is such that it would be idle to expect any developments there except at the cost entirely of St. Louis. The new townsite has its station and there is no intention of interfering with it. It has its siding; it has a recently constructed elevator, and will have the hotel and store now in course of erection. It may be said to have the potentialities for a small town. St. Louis is already a small town and only lacks railway accommodation.

I am of the view that the interests of rival townsites, with the possibilities of gain or loss to their promoters, are not questions which should govern the board in the selection of location for railway facilities. The question for the board is the preponderating question of public necessity and convenience. Railways are constructed with a view, among other things, of serving the inhabitants of the districts through which they pass.

Beyond all question the preponderating public convenience and necessity would call for railway facilities at old St. Louis. The question for determination is whether or not the objections from the standpoint of railway construction and operation, endorsed as they have been by the assistant engineer of the board, necessitate a denial of that public interest. In my opinion they do not. While in the case of a main line, with high speed movements, full effect might have to be given to the arguments advanced by the railway company, a very different position arises in considering traffic on this branch line.

The question has been carefully considered by the board's chief engineer and by its chief operating officer, and they have recommended that an order should be made for a ten-car spur at old St. Louis with a trailing point switch towards the bridge over the Saskatchewan river; the spur to be constructed at the point designated in red on the plan on file with the board.

An order should go requiring its construction.

Commissioner Goodeve concurred.

Ordered accordingly.

SESSIONAL PAPER No. 20c

re PROPOSED LOCATION OF C.N.R. STATION AT FORT WILLIAM, ONT.

Judgment, Chief Commissioner DRAYTON, July 20, 1914.

Plans of the new Canadian Northern Railway station have been submitted by the railway company and approved by the city and Board of Trade authorities, neither of which bodies take any stand on the question as to whether or not the station should be continued at the present site.

Mr. Douglas Kerr, on behalf of himself and other ratepayers, and particularly on behalf of the School Board of which he is a member, protested against the continuance of the station at the point in question, having regard to the danger to children and others using the level crossing. Mr. Kerr suggests a site on the main line. This site, as it is somewhat inaccessible, is not convenient either for the receiving or delivering of traffic. It is, however, undoubtedly safer, in so far as the question of street use is concerned.

I find, however, that the station is placed in its present position as a result of the vote of the ratepayers of the municipality, and also as the result of an agreement with the vendors of the land—the Messrs. McKellar.

The question of safe highway crossings is one in which the municipality is vitally interested, and although the station was placed where it now stands as the result of a municipal by-law coupled with the vote of the ratepayers in favour of a money by-law granting aid to the company, I am of the opinion that, should the municipality desire it, and will extend its street-car system to the Canadian Northern main line along Victoria avenue, no injustice will be done the railway company. The station on the main line would become reasonably accessible, and in the long run a station on the main line will be in the best interests both of the public and the railway, although with the present development of the city and means of access to the main line location, the contrary is the case to-day.

If the municipality is not desirous of the change being made, and of extending the car system, an order should go approving the plans submitted for a building and lay-out on the present site, with the modifications recommended by the board's chief operating officer, and which are as follows:—

> "The railway company to put in a suitable passenger depot with platforms between Victoria avenue and Mile street; move the freight shed to the north side of Mile street; plan a re-arrangement of the tracks to serve the same; and require the railway company not to stop its train on Victoria avenue; and to put in some form of protection at Mile street.

By giving effect to this modification, the danger to those using the highways is to a considerable degree decreased.

Mr. Commissioner Goodeve concurred.

TOWNSHIP OF OLIVER *v.* C.P.R.

Judgment, Chief Commissioner DRAYTON, July 20, 1914.

This is a complaint made by the municipality of the township of Oliver, complaining of the inadequate train service from Murillo to Fort William furnished by the Canadian Pacific Railway.

The case was heard at the board's sitting at Port Arthur on June 27, 1914, when it appeared that the former local train had been taken off as far back as last February or March, the company showing that there was not business enough for the train to do.

The board intimated at the hearing that the company should flag such trains as would enable the residents of Murillo, and the neighbourhood thereof, to go to Port Arthur or Fort William, their market towns, and return the same day. Mr. Murphy, the company's superintendent, objected to any such action on the ground that the trains were heavy and that there was a one per cent grade.

The board accordingly directed the particular objections raised by Mr. Murphy to be inquired into by its operating officer. He agrees that the grade is heavy and that the trains are heavy. He finds, however, that the company has already stopped this train at other places where the conditions are not more onerous. Of course simply because a train is stopped at one point is no reason why it should be stopped at other points. Such action, if worked out logically, would render the service of the particular train in question of little, and sometimes of practically no value.

It appears that at the point in question when the company is running the maximum trainload, a double engine is used. With this double engine already in use at this point, and in view of the fact that a similar service has been given the district in the past, I am of the opinion that the recommendation of the chief operating officer should be given effect to and an order made that train No. 3 be stopped on flag at Murillo, and flag stop for trains 7 and 1 be cancelled. With this privilege, the residents in the neighbourhood can go to Port Arthur or Fort William and return the same day. In view of the distance from Murillo to Port Arthur this is a condition which I think they are entitled to in view of the service on the company's line.

Commissioner Goodeve concurred.

Ordered that the Canadian Pacific Railway Company be, and it is hereby required, forthwith, to stop its train No. 3 on flag signal, at Murillo station; the railway company to be at liberty to cancel the present arrangement of stopping trains Nos. 7 and 1 at the said station.

APPLICATION OF THE GRAND TRUNK RAILWAY COMPANY FOR AN ORDER REQUIRING THE HAMILTON AND TORONTO SEWER PIPE COMPANY TO REPLACE THE SIDING TO THE HAMILTON AND TORONTO SEWER PIPE COMPANY AND THE FOWLERS CANADIAN COMPANY IN THE SAME CONDITION AS IT WAS BEFORE THEY INTERFERED WITH IT.

Judgment, Mr. Commissioner McLean, July 23, 1914.

The application of the Grand Trunk Railway Company sets out the fact as follows:—

> "The siding in question serves the Hamilton and Toronto Sewer Pipe Company and the Fowler Canadian Company jointly, and its construction, maintenance and operation is authorized by Order No. 6040 of the board, dated November 11, 1908. It would appear that recently the Hamilton and Toronto Sewer Pipe Company, without permission from the board or any one else, took up part of this siding, which prevented our access to the Fowlers Canadian Company which was at the end of the siding. We complained to the Sewer Pipe Company at the time, and delayed making an application to the board until it appeared that no other course was open to us. The Fowlers Canadian Company objected to the removal of the track and insist upon its replacement. We would, therefore, apply for an order of the board requiring the Hamilton and Toronto Sewer Pipe Company to replace this siding in the same condition as it was before they interfered with it."

The Hamilton and Toronto Sewer Pipe Company has submitted to the board copies of its correspondence with the Grand Trunk Railway Company. Under date of March 28, 1914, it wrote to the city agent of the Grand Trunk Railway Company at Hamilton stating that it desired to have certain spur tracks re-arranged; and it stated that it desired to take out its present coal siding between the kilns. This is the siding which is concerned in the present application. The Grand Trunk agent at Hamilton was again written to under date of April 7, and under date of April 8, the Sewer Pipe Company was informed by him that the matter had been taken up with the Commissioner of Industries at Montreal.

In its letter to the board, dated June 27, the Sewer Pipe Company states that nothing has been done by the railway in the matter.

From the report of the board's chief operating officer on file, it appears that as early as April 23, the portion of the siding which extended on to the property of the Fowlers Canadian Company had been torn up just north of the last pair of kilns, and an excavation had been made for the foundation of a new kiln.

By Order 6040, dated November 11, 1908, an order was issued by the board for the construction of certain spurs through the premises of the Hamilton and Toronto Sewer Pipe Company and the Fowlers Canadian Company. This order legalized certain spurs which were already on the ground and had been in existence a considerable period of time prior to the date of the order. The matter was spoken to at Hamilton on October 13, 1908, and was spoken to at greater length at Toronto on November 11, 1908, when the terms of the order were discussed. Clauses 1 and 2 of Order 6040, which issued after the hearings in question, are, in view of what was stated in the course of the hearings, especially pertinent. They are as follows:

> "1. That the applicant company do not expropriate the land upon which the said sidings are situated, without first obtaining the consent of the board, notwithstanding the approval of the said plans."
>
> "2. That nothing in this order contained affect, prejudice or alter any of the rights or obligations existing between the Hamilton and Torronto Sewer Pipe Company, Fowlers Canadian Company, and the applicant company, or any two of these; and that all such rights and obligations continue as if this order had not been made."

In the course of the discussion both at Hamilton and at Toronto, reference was made to the fact that the Sewer Pipe Company did not desire the legalizing of the existing spurs to take such shape as would preclude it from re-arranging them. As, for example, Mr. Cowan, speaking as counsel for the Grand Trunk, which was the applicant, used the following language, in reference to the position taken by the Sewer Pipe Company.—Vol. 68, p. 8367:

> "That is the whole trouble; the tracks are there and they are there with their consent; but when we come to legalize them, they say we may not always want that track coming across on to the Fowlers."

Again in speaking of the attitude of this company, the following language was also used by him at page 8368 of the same volume:

> "Mr. New says, I do not mind the track there as long as I don't want the use of the land. I said any time you want to use it, take the track up."

At the hearing in Toronto on November 11, 1908, Mr. Cowan, acting for the Grand Trunk, stated that the Fowler Company desired to have a provision in the order that the sidings in which they were interested should not be removed from off the lands of the Sewer Pipe Company, without the sanction of the board having first been obtained; and a suggestion was made by Mr. Cowan, at page 9021 of volume 69, that such an arrangement would be a proper one. Mr. Masten, who appeared for the Sewer Pipe Company, contended that the rights possessed by the Fowler Company under existing agreements should not be added to.

Throughout the discussion which took place, the Sewer Pipe Company contended that the order legalizing the existing spurs should not give to the Fowler Company any greater rights than they already possessed under existing agreements; and this position was accepted by the board. At volume 69, p. 9028, Mr. Cowan again recurred to his position that before the siding running off the Sewer Pipe Company's land on to the land of the Fowler Company was removed, an order of the board should be obtained; and the late Chief Commissioner Mabee stated that this would carry the existing agreement that the Sewer Pipe Company had entered into further than it

then went. It was also stated by the late chief commissioner, at page 9029, that he knew of no order whereby the Fowler interests should be given a right of way over the land of the Sewer Pipe Company; and Mr. Cowan agreed that this should not be done, unless there was absolute expropriation of the property to reach the Fowler Company. In summing up the matter, the following language was used by the chief commissioner at page 9209:

> "I do not see any way to do it, Mr. Cowan, but to approve these plans subject to all existing rights. If we go any further, we will be interfering with the existing rights."

There has been filed with the board a copy of an agreement entered into on July 30, 1898, between the Hamilton and Toronto Sewer Pipe Company, Limited, of the first part; the administrators of the estate of the late Thomas Lawry, of the second part; and Thomas Lawry & Son, Limited, of the third part. It is recited that the Hamilton and Toronto Sewer Pipe Company, Limited, own a certain railway siding, "running along the easterly side of the said Sewer Pipe Company's factory." It is further recited that Thomas Lawray & Son, Limited, "are desirous of passing over the said easterly railway siding with one or two cars of coal per week for the "use of the factory of the said Thomas Lawry & Son, Limited." The terms on which the use of the siding was permitted are set out. It is further provided that in the event of the said Thomas Lawry & Son, Limited, using the said easterly railway siding by passing over same more than one or two cars of coal per week, in such case the said Thomas Lawry & Son, Limited, agree to pay the said Hamilton and Toronto Sewer Pipe Company, Limited, one-half of whatever the Grand Trunk Railway Company may charge the said Sewer Pipe Company for the use of the said railway siding; the same to be paid at least once a year from the date hereof. The agreement was entered into for a period of five years. Apparently Thomas Lawry & Son, Limited, were the predecessors in title of the Fowler Company. The agreement which has been referred to was spoken of by Mr. Cowan, who acted for the Sewer Pipe Company, at Toronto, at the hearing on July 3, 1914, as being an agreement between the Fowler Company and the Sewer Pipe Company; and it has been filed by him. The history of the agreements, if any, between the Sewer Pipe Company and the Fowler Company since 1903 has not been developed before the board.

At the hearing at Toronto, the Fowler Company, through some oversight was not notified. It has made a submission in writing. It states in the course of its submission that it had had the use of the siding in question over the Hamilton and Toronto Sewer Pipe Company's property for the last fifteen years or more; and that while it originally used it principally for receiving coal and other supplies into its premises, it had for some time back been using this siding as an outlet to the Grand Trunk for all the offal and by-products manufactured by its plant.

The board in issuing Order 6040 was careful to state that it did not "affect, prejudice or alter" the rights and obligations as between the Sewer Pipe Company and the Fowler Company, and that all such rights and obligations were to continue as if this order had not been made. So far as the record of the agreements is before the board, the Fowler Company had the right to handle over the siding a limited number of cars of a particular commodity and nothing more. Whether there were any conditions in respect of notice to be given in connection with the discontinuance of the spur is a matter which would, in view of what has been said, depend on the terms of the agreement or agreements, if any, in respect thereto. Nothing bearing on any obligation in this respect, if any such obligation there be, has been developed before the board.

It is shown throughout the record of the hearings that the Sewer Pipe Company insisted on retaining the control of the sidings on their own land, to the extent of taking them up if necessary. This contention was placed squarely before the board; and with a full knowledge of this, the board refused to place in the order a clause providing that before the siding in question was interfered with the matter should be

heard and dealt with by order. Consequently, the Sewer Pipe Company's action in the present application is not in violation of Order 6040. The only way in which the board can provide that the Fowler Company shall have an access from the line of the Grand Trunk to its own line across the Sewer Pipe Company's land, would be by authorizing the Grand Trunk, on application, to expropriate a right of way across the Sewer Pipe Company's land.

Assistant Chief Commissioner Scott, concurred.

APPLICATION OF THE MUNICIPAL CORPORATION OF THE TOWN OF PARRY SOUND, ONTARIO, THAT THE BOARD RECONSIDER ORDER NO. 4088, DATED NOVEMBER 28, 1907, AND FOR AN ORDER DIRECTING THE CANADIAN PACIFIC RAILWAY COMPANY TO CONSTRUCT A SUBWAY UNDER ITS RAILWAY AT ARMSTRONG STREET, IN THE TOWN OF PARRY SOUND, ONTARIO.

Oral judgment delivered by Assistant Chief Commissioner SCOTT at the close of the hearing September 15, 1914:

In this matter, when the line of railway was to be built an agreement was made dated the 17th October, 1907, between the town of Parry Sound and the Canadian Pacific Railway Company whereby, among other things, certain subways were provided at a number of streets. The scheme agreed upon by the railway and the town at that time was that a subway should be put at or near Marion street, and an arrangement was made as to how the work was to be done and as to the distribution of the cost of it between the railway and the municipality. Through no fault of anyone that subway has not been built.

The municipality now comes before the board and asks us to substitute a subway at Armstrong street for the subway at Marion. It is pointed out that Armstrong street is a more direct line from Margaret and Ethel streets and Avenue road to the public school on the east side of the track. The railway company objects to the application of the municipality pointing out, and it is quite clear from their plan, that their intention ultimately is to extend northward across Armstrong on the east side of their tracks. Their plan shows that they have their freight shed, their coal shed, and a number of sidings now on the east side of their tracks south of Armstrong, and it is quite clear if they are to extend, as undoubtedly they will in a growing town like Parry Sound, that the only way they can do so is by extending northward across Armstrong and occupying the territory north of that street.

Under the circumstances the board thinks that the agreements should be adhered to. We do not feel justified in interfering with the arrangement that was made by the parties at the time. We think they should stand by the agreement. This application is dismissed.

APPLICATION OF THE MONTREAL BOARD OF TRADE, PER W. S. TILSTON, MONTREAL, P.Q., ON BEHALF OF THE MONTREAL WHOLESALE GROCERS' GUILD AND THE MONTREAL WHOLESALE LIQUOR ASSOCIATION, FOR AN ORDER DIRECTING THE RAILWAY COMPANIES TO REINSTATE MIXED CARLOAD COMMODITY RATES BY OCTOBER 1.

Judgment, Mr. Commissioner MCLEAN, September 30, 1914.

The complaint of the Montreal Board of Trade was supported at the recent hearing in Montreal by Mr. Marshall, on behalf of the Toronto Board of Trade, and Messrs. Balfour, Cleghorn, Hebert, Blain, and Terroux.

While reference is made herein to the tariffs of the Canadian Pacific Railway alone, this is for convenience only, as its tariffs are identical with those of the other railways concerned.

Under C.P.R. tariff No. E-1953, C.R.C.E.-2353, provision was made under Item 31 as follows, regarding groceries and dried fruits:—

"Groceries classifying 5th class and dried fruits 4th class, straight carloads, in the Canadian classification, when shipped in mixed carloads, will

take carload rate on each commodity, carload weight, subject to the minimum 24,000 pounds. If total weight of shipment be less than 24,000 pounds, dried fruits will be charged on basis of 4th class rate, carload weight, and groceries 5th class for balance of weight necessary to make up full minimum weight."

Item 33 of the same tariff, dealing with liquors, mixed carloads, reads as follows:—

"Liquors, domestic or foreign, in wood, and in cases, jars or stone jugs, when shipped in mixed carloads, will be accepted at the respective carload rate, actual weight, subject to minimum of 24,000 pounds. If the total weight of shipment be less than 24,000 pounds in waybilling the weight of the liquor in wood shall be increased to make up the full weight."

In C.P.R. tariff C.R.C. No. E-2843, applicable from points in eastern Canada to Port Arthur and west thereof, these items are no longer carried. This tariff, issued August 24, became effective as to reductions September 1, and as to increases October 1. The effect of these cancellations is to leave the matter as it is provided for by rule 2 of the classification. Under rule 2, subsection b, it is provided that when the articles shipped have a carload rating and are of more than one class, the carload rate and minimum carload weight of the article in the highest class shall apply on all the articles that make up the carload. The same provision is to be found under subsection c of rule 2, in regard to shipments west of and including Port Arthur and points west thereof, the provision in this connection being limited of course by the arrangement that exists in regard to trade lists in the west.

In the case of liquors, the item already referred to deals with the special mixing privilege given to liquors, domestic or foreign. There is contained in the classification a special provision whereby in the case of native wines, native methylated spirits, and native spirits of alcohol, etc., on a movement of 4th and 5th class articles in the same car, the articles are allowed to mix on their respective ratings. This is the only departure from the classification rule already referred to which is to be found in the classification, and was explained at the hearing as being in the nature of a concession to a home industry.

In addition to the complaint heard at Montreal communications, both telegraphic and written, have been received from Winnipeg and from Vancouver in opposition to the cancellation of the items. On the other hand, communications have been received from Regina and from Edmonton in support of the action taken by the railways.

As has been set out, the tariff from points east of Port Arthur carried a notice of more than thirty days. In the case of the tariff from Port Arthur west, C.R.C. W-1953, the date of issue was July 30, and the effective date as to advances September 1.

In the cancellations from other points, a different situation appears. The cancellations covering a series of points from Calgary to Yorkton are covered by C.R.C. W-1959, which was issued August 18, effective September 1. Winnipeg is covered by the same tariff, with the same date of issuance and same effective date. In the case of Vancouver, tariff C.R.C. W-1715 was issued August 26, with effective date September 1.

By section 328, sub-section 3, as amended by 1 and 2, Geo. V, chapter 22, section 11, it is provided that when a special freight tariff advances any toll hitherto charged, 30 days' notice shall be given of such increase. In the sub-section, the word "toll" is used. The definition of "toll", as contained in sub-section 30 of section 2 of the Railway Act, indicates that toll or rate may be alternatively.

It was urged by the railways at the hearing that instead of there being an increase in the rate charged there had, on account of the rate reductions directed by the decision in the Western Rates Case, been a decrease. In one sense this is true, if attention is paid to the class rate alone; but it must be remembered that the

effect of removing the arrangement whereby, hitherto, articles were allowed to mix in carloads on their respective ratings and replacing it by the general provision as set out in the rule of classification already referred to, was to increase the aggregate toll paid for the movement of a given quantity.

The definition of toll or rate in the Railway Act, as already referred to, is in terms of the amendment of 7-8 Edward VII, chap. 61, part 2, so wide in its scope that it is justifiable in dealing with the provisions of sub-section 3 of section 328 to consider as entering into the question of whether there has or has not been an advance, the effect of such a change as has here been made.

The situation in regard to the actual notice given in the case of Winnipeg, Calgary and Vancouver, and the initial points covered by their respective tariffs which covered the cancellations, has been set out. There has not been in these cases a notice given which satisfies the requirements of sub-section 3 of section 328.

Some telegraphic communication took place between the board's traffic department and the Chief of the Tariff Bureau of the Canadian Pacific Railway Company at Winnipeg. The board was asked if it was willing to waive statutory notice on tariffs issued under the board's decision in the Western Rates Case and the order thereunder. It was represented by the railway company that on account of congestion in printing there was difficulty in meeting the requirements as to notice. The request dealt simply with tariffs issued under the aforesaid order of the board; and, in reply, the board stated that on account of the wide publicity given to the findings of the board as set out in its judgment in the Western Rates Case, tariffs issued in compliance therewith might, under the circumstances above outlined, be put in on less than statutory notice.

The cancellations dealt with in the present application were not changes directed by the board's judgment and the order thereunder.

In the hearing at Montreal, the railways urged that on the merits the cancellations should stand. The board, however, cannot go into the question of the merits until the requirements of the Act in connection with notice are complied with. In so far as the changes created by dropping the items in question from the tariffs concerned in the movement out of Winnipeg, Calgary and Vancouver, already referred to, are concerned the situation is that on account of lack of statutory notice the cancellations are non-effective. As to the tariffs from Port Arthur westward, and from points east of Port Arthur to Port Arthur and west thereof, there has been statutory notice. The hitherto existing arrangement as to the points already referred to, where insufficient notice has been given, should forthwith be reinstalled. And until the requirements as to notice are complied with, the board can express no opinion as to the justifiability or otherwise of the cancellations in question.

It is true that as to Port Arthur and as to the movements from points east thereof, provision has been made for proper statutory notice. To interfere with these tariffs in so far as the cancellations are concerned may seem to be a hardship on the railways. But the situation is that to so continue them would work a discrimination against these points by depriving them of the mixing privileges which the railways have not, by their non-compliance with the requirements as to notice set out in the Railway Act, taken away from the other points referred to.

In so far as Port Arthur is concerned, the cancellations should be disallowed and the arrangement reinstated. As to the movement from points east of Port Arthur to Port Arthur and points west thereof, the cancellations should be suspended. In this way, the whole matter may, if need be, be gone into on its merits, when the requirements as to notice are complied with.

Assistant Chief Commissioner Scott concurred.

Order in accordance with the judgment issued.

Judgment, Mr. Commissioner McLean, October 14, 1914.

The second sentence of the second paragraph of page 2 of the judgment in this matter rendered September 30, 1914, reads as follows:—

> "There is contained in the classification a special provision whereby in the case of native wines, native methylated spirits, and native spirits of alcohol, etc., on a movement of 4th and 5th class articles in the same car, the articles are allowed to mix on their respective ratings."

The sentence as given in the judgment was put in a condensed way and omitted the words "also lime fruit juice," which appear in item 18 on page 106 of the classification.

Representations have been made by Messrs. Walsh and Tilston that the use of the adjective "native" in connection with methylated spirits and spirits of alcohol, etc., unduly limited the scope of what was intended by the item.

While the classification is, in my opinion, as worded, open to the construction which I placed upon it, I find that the chairman of the Advisory Committee of the Canadian Freight Association has it as his understanding that the words "lime fruit juice, methylated spirits and spirits of alcohol" mentioned in the item are given the same treatment therein, irrespective of whether they are of native or foreign manufacture. This is in agreement with the position taken by Messrs. Walsh and Tilston.

In view of the understanding which has arisen and the request for a ruling on the matter, it appears, in view of the interpretation which both the railways and the shippers place on the item in question, that the paragraph in item 18 of page 106, which reads as follows: "Native, also lime fruit juice, methylated spirits and spirits of alcohol" is to be read as stating that the same treatment is given under this item to lime fruit juice, methylated spirits and spirits of alcohol, regardless of whether they are of native or foreign origin.

Assistant Chief Commissioner Scott concurred.

DENHOLM DRAINAGE, UNDER GUELPH AND GODERICH RAILWAY.

Judgment, Assistant Chief Commissioner SCOTT, October 5, 1914.

John Denholm has complained to the board that the construction of the Goderich branch of the Canadian Pacific Railway has deprived him of the proper use of a portion of his farm, on lots 27 and 28, concession 4, in the township of Hullett, because of the lack of proper facilities of drainage under the railway. The matter has been taken up by correspondence with the complainant and the railway company; and, the assistant chief engineer of the board, Mr. Simmons, having made an inspection on the ground, reports that: "There is no doubt but that the pipe which is at mileage 96·85 should be lowered about 18 inches."

Some months ago, accompanied by a representative of the Canadian Pacific Railway Company and Mr. Denholm, I made an inspection of the property in question. A part of Mr. Denholm's farm on the north of the railway track which is low lying land cannot be used for agricultural purposes because the pipe carrying the drainage under the railway company's tracks is not low enough; as, our engineer says this pipe should be placed 18 inches lower than it now is. If this change was made in the culvert, Mr. Denholm's low land could be drained and made suitable for agricultural purposes. It is estimated that the cost of lowering the pipe which carried the drain under the railway would be in the vicinity of $200. The only question is, whether the drainage should be done at the expense of the railway company, or Mr. Denholm.

Under section 250 of the Railway Act, the obligation is clearly placed upon the railway company to do just such work as is now required by Mr. Denholm.

It is contended by the railway company that in the conveyance to its successors in title, the Guelph and Goderich Railway Company, of the right of way through the Denholm farm from Mr. Denholm's predecessors in title, that the company is relieved

from any responsibility in this matter. The language of the clause in the conveyance in question is as follows:

> "And this indenture further witnesseth that the said price or sum includes compensation to the party of the third part (the land owner), his heirs, executors, administrators and assigns, for all damages which may be sustained by the said party of the third part or any of them by reason of the exercise upon the said lands hereby conveyed of the powers of the party of the second part as a railway company, or any of them."

There is nothing in the conveyance with reference to the question of drainage; nor, is there anything to show that it was the intention of the parties to permit the railway company to contract itself outside the provisions of the Railway Act; if indeed it were possible for it to do so.

Paragraph *b*, of subsection 2, of section 250 of the Railway Act states that whenever a land owner desires to obtain means of drainage under the railway, the board may order the company to construct such drainage, and may use its discretion upon what terms and conditions the work shall be done.

If the railway was not there, Mr. Denholm could easily drain his land. The existence of the railway prevents him from doing so. The language of the Act is quite clear; and, I do not think any general clause of release from damages in a conveyance should relieve the railway company from the obligation placed upon it by the statute.

An order should go for the railway company to lower the existing pipe under its tracks 18 inches, at its own expense, and the work should be completed within 30 days.

Concurred in by Commissioner Goodeve.

Reported in 17 Can. Ry. Cas. 318.

COMPLAINT MADE BY W. J. GUEST FISH COMPANY, LIMITED, OF WINNIPEG, MANITOBA, WITH REGARD TO EXPRESS RATES CHARGED ON FRESH FISH IN CARLOAD LOTS FROM VANCOUVER TO WINNIPEG.

Judgment, Chief Commissioner DRAYTON, October 12, 1914:

This complaint was heard at a sitting of the board held in Winnipeg on the 26th day of May, 1914.

The company, at that time, had not had an opportunity to make its answer; but, for the convenience of the complainant, the case was then heard, the right being reserved to the company to file its answer, a copy of which was to be sent to the complainant, who would file his reply in case the company's answer required it.

At the hearing referred to, Mr. Douglas, who appeared for the complainant, stated:

> "This question of carload rates on fresh fish from Vancouver and New Westminster to Winnipeg would have been brought before your notice some considerable time ago, only for the fact that for 4 or 5 years the Department of Marine and Fisheries have subsidized the fish dealers in Saskatchewan and Manitoba to the extent of one-third of the express rates. Consequently it has considerably reduced the laying-in cost for express service, and it made a very low rate for the carloads of fish being brought into Winnipeg.
>
> "About four months ago, the Department of Marine and Fisheries decided that the development of the fish business in Winnipeg had got to such an extent that they were justified in withdrawing the subsidy."

Mr. Douglas showed that the ground on which the application was made, was that fresh fish consigned from Vancouver to dealers in Boston, is shipped all the way to Boston at a rate of $3 per 100 on the net weight of the fish; whilst the same kind of fish, in a car of like proportions consigned to dealers in Winnipeg, cost $2.50 per 100.

Mr. Douglas likewise pointed out that the Boston rate applied also to Montreal and Toronto, so that dealers in Montreal, Toronto, and Boston could lay fish down at only 50 cents a hundred more than Winnipeg dealers have to pay.

The complainants submitted that the rate of $2.50 should be reduced to $2.

The written statement of the Department of Marine and Fisheries was to the same effect, namely, that the rate on carload lots to Calgary, Regina, and Winnipeg, is not equitable when compared with the rate to Boston, Montreal, and Toronto, in view of the great difference in the distances.

The department subsequently pointed out that the subsidy referred to by Mr. Douglas was not intended to cover carload movements.

The company, in its reply, submits that the Boston rate is controlled by circumstances and conditions that in no way affect the situation, so far as Winnipeg is concerned; that companies having lines through the United States established a blanket rate of $3 from Puget Sound to the principal cities in the east; and that the existing $3 rate from Vancouver to Boston merely meets that competition. The company also points out that not only have Winnipeg dealers an advantage of 50 cents in the rate as against Boston, but they have free delivery service, while a charge of 15 cents per 100 pounds is made in Boston; and that the amount of traffic moving into Winnipeg is inconsiderable compared with the traffic moving into Boston, the business done by the company last year in Winnipeg being only 18 cars as against 84 cars in Boston; while, for the four months of the current year, the company has handled 21 cars for Boston and only one car for Winnipeg.

The complainants in their reply to the company's answer admit that, in quoting the rate from Vancouver to Boston, the express company naturally had to meet the competition of companies operating in the United States; but they contend that this fact has no bearing whatever on the Vancouver-Montreal, or Vancouver-Toronto rate; and that, while 15 cents per 100 extra may be charged for some of the deliveries in Boston, the deliveries in both Toronto and Montreal are free, as they are in Winnipeg.

The complainants again insist that on the mileage basis of the $3 rate to points in the east, the Winnipeg rate should be much lower than it is at present.

It is a well established principle that the cost of carriage, as estimated on a mileage haul, decreased in proportion to the distance carried; so no exact comparison can be made on which to determine the fairness of rates one way or the other merely on that basis. This principle applies particularly to all commodity rates, and has perhaps been carried to its furthest extent in the rate on wheat moving from the provinces to the seaboard.

In consideration of the grain rates, many instances could be found when the rate per mile for the shorter distances would show a greater difference than that which is shown in comparing the rates in question as between Winnipeg and Boston.

While this is so, the difference in the rates and the general tariff structure is of such a character as to render necessary a careful survey of the situation. For example: The rate to Calgary is the same as the rate to Winnipeg. The mileage calculation is more favourable to Calgary compared with Winnipeg, than it is to Winnipeg compared with Toronto.

If there is any hardship resulting from the present rate schedule, it is manifest that the dealer in Calgary has as great a grievance as the dealer in Winnipeg. The fact is that this scale has not been built up on a mileage basis at all.

To illustrate how far removed the rates in question are from mileage rates, it may be noted that the Vancouver-Winnipeg rate on merchandise, permitted under the board's judgment, delivered in the original express inquiry—the only express rate based on mileage—was $7.25; and, in the judgment recently delivered, this rate was reduced to $6.

The board has also, however, dealt with the tariff known as scale "N" which is a tariff based on the mileage tariff for merchandise and applies to specific commodities, among which are fish.

In the old judgment the rate under this scale, Vancouver to Winnipeg, was $5.20; this was reduced in the recent judgment to $4.20.

The fact is beyond all dispute that the special $3 Vancouver-Boston rate has nothing whatever to do with mileage, and while it may have been put in in the first instance only for railway competitive reasons, is also a rate which makes it possible for the catch on the Pacific to be marketed in the east.

The situation in Canada is exactly the same as it is in the United States. The competition on the Atlantic coast not only of carriers but probably to a greater extent the competition of rival products has determined the initial rate, and rates to intermediate points have been fixed under the blanketing system, with the result that the Toronto rate is the same as that to Buffalo and Detroit; and with the further result that the Winnipeg rate is the same as the rate to St. Paul, Minneapolis, and Duluth.

The Vancouver-Boston rate is admitted to be competitive but the American rate to Buffalo in turn, in any event, controls the Toronto situation. Toronto and Buffalo are in contiguous territories and take, under the tariffs of the American Express Companies, a similar rating necessitating a similar or lower rate by the Dominion Express Company.

Taking the Vancouver-Winnipeg rate by itself, it cannot be said that the charge is an unfair charge for the services rendered. The complaint, if sustainable at all, is only sustainable under the discriminatory clauses.

The usual ratio that express charges bear to first class freight rates exceeds two to one. In fact the express rate is more often three to one. The express service is much more expensive. The goods are carried by fast passenger train instead of by a slow freight; they receive personal attention and supervision by the company, and include wagon service at both ends, although I do not suppose that any wagon service is necessary to be performed in Vancouver in this case.

The Vancouver-Winnipeg freight rate, car lots, is $1.25, with a minimum of 24,000 pounds the rate complained of is $2.50 with a minimum or 20,000 pounds.

If the movement was to be considered not having regard to a freight car lot rate, but as express is usually considered with reference to the first-class freight rate, it would be found that this rate is 50 cents per hundred cheaper than the first-class rate from Vancouver to Winnipeg, which is $3.

The fish has to be carried in containers and on ice and it has been calculated that the additional weight represented by the containers and the ice brings the weight of 20,000 pounds at which the rate is charged, to 32,000 pounds, so that, as a matter of fact, the company has to carry 38 per cent more weight than it is paid for. These calculations are probably more approximations than actual, but there is no doubt that the handling of fish does entail the carriage of a considerable extra weight.

On the question of discrimination, I am of the opinion that it is impossible to say that the Winnipeg dealer is injured owing to the fact that the rate to Toronto is too low. The Winnipeg fish dealer is not in competition with the Toronto dealer nor is the Winnipeg fish market in any way affected by the local Toronto market. If the rate to Toronto were raised there would be no advantage to the Winnipeg dealer. Probably the movement of fish from the Pacific to Toronto would be prejudicially affected, as fresh fish from the west to Toronto enters into direct competition with fish moving from the Atlantic, as well as fish caught in the Great Lakes. For the same reasons it cannot be said that the dealer in Calgary is injured by reason of the fact that the dealer in Winnipeg, on the local haul, gets the same rate as himself. In Winnipeg, again, there is an effective local competition in fish, the yearly product in white fish from Lake Manitoba amounting during the fiscal year ending March 31, 1913, to over 3,000,000 pounds.

Over and above all this, the traffic under consideration will probably at an early date travel at least to some extent by another route.

The fishing grounds of the Pacific are contiguous to Prince Rupert and 450 miles away, approximately, from Vancouver.

The Canadian Express Company, operating from Prince Rupert, has, since the hearing, received at Prince Rupert 16 carloads of fish for eastern points via Winnipeg.

It is reasonable to suppose that, with the elimination of the water carriage of 450 miles, the cost of fish f.o.b. cars at Prince Rupert should be materially less than the cost which has hitherto obtained at Vancouver.

I do not think that the rate can be interfered with.

Concurred in by Commissioner Goodeve.

THE ERIE AND ONTARIO RAILWAY COMPANY CROSSING OVER THE RIGHT OF WAY OF THE NIAGARA, ST. CATHARINES AND TORONTO RAILWAY COMPANY.

Judgment, Mr. Commissioner McLean, October 17, 1914.

The Erie and Ontario Railway Company relies in support of its contention that priority of construction, not of approval of location, should govern, on

Canadian Northern Railway Company v. Canadian Pacific Railway Company, 11 Can. Ry. Cas., 432.

Grand Trunk Pacific Railway Company v. Canadian Pacific Railway Company, 7 Can. Ry. Cas., 299.

In the former of these cases no question of title, such as is raised in the present application, was before the board. In the latter, which is known as the Nokomis Crossing Case, two factors were involved, title and priority of construction. The judgment held, at p. 301, that the Canadian Pacific having constructed in accordance with the terms of its enabling legislation was entitled to a grant covering its roadbed, and that the producion by the Grand Trunk Pacific of a subsequent Crown grant in no way curtailed the rights of ownership the Canadian Pacific had acquired under prior legislation. It is within the reasoning of the judgment that where title was alleged title was fundamental, and that priority of construction simply emphasized the rights flowing from ownership.

The title in the present case is in the Toronto and Niagara Power Company. The Niagara, St. Catharines and Toronto Railway Company has a right of way on the property of the Power Company. While the title is in the Power Company, the relations between it and the railway are such that the latter has a guarantee of the integrity of its right of way, which while falling short of absolute title savours of the attributes of title. Under this condition, the railway falls within the position taken in regard to seniority of title in the Nokomis Crossing Case, and should be treated accordingly.

APPLICATION OF THE CITY OF MONTREAL TO OPEN CERTAIN STREETS IN LONGUE POINTE WARD, OVER THE TRACKS OF THE CANADIAN NORTHERN QUEBEC RAILWAY.

Judgment, Assistant Chief Commissioner Scott, October 19, 1914:

At the hearing the railway company admitted that it thought Hector and Des Ormeaux streets might be opened. Recently Mr. Commissioner McLean and I who heard this matter at a sittings in Montreal, visited the different crossings applied for. We agree with the railway company that both Hector and Des Ormeaux streets should be opened.

Dealing with the other crossings applied for, commencing at the east. As Contrecœur street is only about 200 feet away from Hector street there is no necessity in opening that highway across the railway. De Rocheblave is the next street east from Des Ormeaux. As the latter street is to be opened there is no necessity for De Rocheblave being opened as it is only about 200 feet away. The next four streets west from Des Ormeaux in their order are, Azilda, Baldwin, Lebrun and Mercier. The first three have considerable settlement north of the tracks. There is a highway parallel

to the tracks and adjoining them on the north, and another highway parallel to the tracks on the south so that it is easy to get from one street to another. It is unfortunate that these streets which are at right angles to the railway are so close to each other. There is not more than 250 feet space from one street to another; and, between some it is considerably less than this. The territory north of the railway at this section is growing fast and there is evidence that a considerable population will be found there in the near future. Undoubtedly, protection will be required at some future date at some of these highway crossings. The fact that the tracks of two companies would have to be crossed increases the danger. The policy of the board when ordering protection at a highway crossing is to place more of the cost of protection on a municipality where its highway is junior to the railway company than where the highway is senior.

In the present case therefore, the expense which may be put upon the municipality in the future should be borne in mind.

Considering all these matters, it seems to me that the interests of the public will be best served if none but absolutely necessary crossings over the railway are permitted. I would suggest that the crossing of Baldwin street be allowed; but that of Azilda on the east and Lebrun on the west be refused. Baldwin street is now being paved and because of its location it is the best one to be opened over the tracks. The railway company have a team track across Baldwin street which will either have to be removed from that street or a provision made for preventing cars from being left upon it which will block the view of the crossing. The railway company should carefully consider this matter and submit to the board a statement of what it is prepared to do.

As far as Mercier street is concerned, there is not the same population to the north of the tracks on this street, and at present we see no necessity for it to be opened across the tracks of the railway.

An order should therefore go granting the municipality's application for the opening of Hector, Des Ormeaux, and Baldwin streets across the railway, and refusing its application in the case of the other streets mentioned. The railway company should also show cause within 30 days, why an order should not go for the removal of its team track across Baldwin street, or for some provision which will insure a good view of the railway line at all times at that crossing.

Commissioner McLean concurred.

Ordered accordingly.

APPLICATION TOWN OF VICTORIAVILLE, QUE., *re* EXTENSION OF ALBERT STREET OVER G.T.R. TRACKS.

Judgment, Commissioner McLean, October 20, 1914.

The proposed crossing on Albert street produced would cross both legs of the Grand Trunk wye. A suggestion was made that by means of a diversion which would cross the tracks about the tail of the wye and connect with rue Côté, which is marked on the plan as not being opened, what was desired by the municipality might be obtained. To work out the diversion in question, it would be necessary to take part of the land belonging to the religious organization of the Sacred Heart. It is contended by the solicitor for the municipality that, under the laws of Quebec, this cannot be done; and his position is not, after consideration, controverted by the solicitor of the railway company.

It is stated that the town is growing east of the tracks and that this crossing is, therefore, necessary. It is also stated that it would be an advantage to have such a crossing, as it would facilitate the movement of cattle to the stockyards; and that it would be preferable to have cattle moved across the proposed point of crossing rather than to have them travel along the highway of the main street, as at present. The two tracks which would have to be crossed if the crossing were granted are 160 feet apart. Two hundred and forty feet in all of the right of way of the railway would

have to be traversed at the proposed crossing. It certainly would be a very unsatisfactory crossing for driving cattle over, because of the opportunity that would be afforded to the cattle to scatter on the right of way, and with even a slight movement of train traffic this would be dangerous. Nothing was adduced in evidence as to the amount of pedestrian or vehicular traffic that might be expected to cross over at the point in question. It is apparent that to travel 240 feet of the right of way of the railway would be unsatisfactory and would have decided elements of danger. The situation is one which, on account of the layout, would be very difficult to look after with adequate protective devices.

While, no doubt, the existing way of getting across the track has inconveniences attached to it, to grant the crossing at the point asked for is not justifiable from the standpoint of public safety.

Assistant Chief Commissioner Scott, concurred.

Order refusing application, issued.

COMPLAINT OF THE RIVERSIDE LUMBER COMPANY, LIMITED, CALGARY, ALTA., *re* RATES CHARGED BY THE CANADIAN PACIFIC RAILWAY COMPANY ON ITS WEYBURN-LETHBRIDGE BRANCH FROM VICEROY TO ASSINIBOIA.

Judgment, Commissioner McLean, October 26, 1914.

Complaint is made that while Order 18381 of December 28, 1912, provided for the opening for the carriage of traffic of the portion of the Weyburn-Lethbridge line lying between Viceroy and Assiniboia, such portion of the line so opened being subject to a speed limitation, the special lumber tariffs from coast and interior mills were not applicable to these points until August 25, 1913.

The application for opening for traffic between the points in question was dated December 23, 1912, and was supported by the affidavit which is required under subsection 2 of section 261. It was set out in the application that "that portion of the Weyburn-Lethbridge branch from Viceroy, mile 75·85, to Assiniboia, mile 112, is sufficiently completed for the safe carriage of traffic and ready for inspection." It may be noted that the affidavit submitted states that the line is "sufficiently completed for the safe carrying of passengers and ready for inspection." The application, however, was treated as one for the carriage of traffic in general.

The report of the board's engineer, dated December 24, found that the road was in shape for opening for traffic, and following thereafter Order 18381 already referred to was issued, the provisions for speed being limited to 20 miles an hour between mileage 75·85 and mile 102, and 15 miles an hour between mileage 102 and mileage 112.

While the order as issued provided for the carriage of traffic subject to no limitation other than that for speed, it appears from a communication from the Verwood Board of Trade that the line had not been taken over by the operating department. When the railway company's attention was drawn to this, it stated that when Order 18381 was applied for it was not the intention to have the operating department take over the line, it being intended simply to give a temporary service to serve the people of the district. The same position was reiterated in the railway company's letter of March 3, 1913, it being there stated that the reason why the line had not actually been taken over by the operating department west of Viceroy was that it was not in good enough condition to stand regular service, and that in order to accommodate settlers the company agreed to bring in supplies for them on construction trains; and the following language was used:

> "It seems to me that the company is taking the proper course in giving additional service on this line rather than they should refrain from making any application to the board until the line was so far completed as to be capable of sustaining a regular freight and passenger service."

Additional complaints were received regarding the service afforded, special reference being made to passenger service. In the month of June, 1913, a daily passenger service was installed.

As has been noted, the railway company took the position that it could only give a limited service, and that it was not feasible to operate this service under any other department than the construction department. The application, however, as has been indicated, was made under section 261 of the Act; and when the railway was asked by the board, under date of June 24, when it intended to apply for an order granting leave under section 261 of the Act, it replied that in its opinion the order already obtained covered this. Following this, on application of the railway company, Order 19776 of July 8, 1913, was issued removing the speed limitation.

The history has been summarized because of its bearing upon the tariff situation.

It appears that until after the issuance of Order 19776 of July 8, 1913, the railway was operated by the construction department. The question of construction tariffs, that is to say, tariffs charged during the period of construction, before a line is opened for traffic, was dealt with in Baker, Reynolds & Co., vs. Canadian Pacific Railway Company 10 Can. Ry. Cas. 151. It was pled there that these construction tariffs were a public convenience, and that since the operation of the line on which the tariff was applicable had not been authorized by the board when the construction tariffs were issued, it would have been useless to file them as the board would have no authority to approve them. It was held, however, by the board that the tolls charged under construction tariffs were illegal; that under section 261 of the Railway Act, no railway or portion thereof, without the leave of the board, could be opened for the carriage of traffic, other than for the purposes of construction of the railway; that under section 327 of the Railway Act, standard freight tariffs must be filed; and subsection 4 of that section prohibits the company from charging any toll until the provisions of the section have been complied with.

While it was contended that it was necessary to operate the mileage now before the board under the construction department, it was brought within the scope of section 261.

It is the practice of the Canadian Pacific Railway Company to make provision in advance for sufficient standard mileage so that when a line is opened for traffic the standard rates apply automatically. In the present instance, the situation was that as soon as the road was opened for traffic the standard tariffs applied, although the operation was in the hands of the construction department.

The stations on the branch from Viceroy to Assiniboia were first published in the Official Mileage Table of the Canadian Pacific Railway Company on May 29, 1913, there being added the following notation: "Carload shipments will be handled at the convenience of the construction department." As has been noted, the speed limitation was removed on July 8, 1913, and effective August 25, 1913, the company published notice that these stations would be included in their various mileage tariffs; also, effective same date, they issued a supplement to their lumber tariff from coast and interior mills to include these points. This date, August 25, is stated by the company to be the date on which the line was formally opened for traffic; that is to say, the day on which the operating department formally took hold of the carriage of freight.

The distinction between the construction and operating departments, on which so much stress has been laid by the railway company, does not appear to be of moment. What is of importance, regardless of how the traffic was handled, is whether the provisions of the Railway Act in regard to tolls have been complied with.

The applicants express the opinion that if tariffs had been published in accordance with the board's Order No. 18381, shippers would not have been charged the difference between the traffic handled under construction rates and the rates called for by the lumber tariff. As has been indicated, the construction rates referred to are in this

case the rates of the standard tariffs. Order No. 18381, however, made no provision as to the rates to be charged. It is not the practice to make any such provision in an order issuing as this did under section 261 of the Railway Act. As a condition precedent to the issuance of such an order, the board satisfies itself that the mileage to be opened is covered by standard tariffs. Standard tariffs existed for the mileage here referred to; so, in so far as compliance with section 327 of the Railway Act is concerned, the railway company was within the statute.

In general, rates under the lumber tariffs which are involved in the present case were put in force a short time after the opening of the road for traffic. Some examples may be given: On the Shaunavon sub-division, the road was opened for traffic on May 1, 1914; the lumber rates were filed May 5. In the case of the forward sub-division, the opening of the road and the filing of rates took place on the same date, viz.: August 25, 1913. In the case of the Neptune sub-division and the Lensford subdivision, the opening of the road and the filing of the rates also took place on the same date. In the case of Sterling subdivision, the opening of the road took place on December 2, 1913, and the rates were filed on February 17, 1914. In the case of the Suffield subdivision, stations Armilgra to Retlaw, inclusive, the road was opened on December 6, 1913, and the rates were filed January 30, 1914. In the case of the Boissevain subdivision, the road was opened December 26, 1913, and the rates were filed January 2, 1914.

There is not, then, a violation of rates prescribed by the board or a refusal to put in rates so ordered.

The situation as to the lumber rates requires some further consideration. These rates are special mileage rates, which, within their territory are of general applicability, and do not vary from one portion of such territory to another with differences in the condition of the traffic or of the cost of operation. As to the portion of railway concerned in the present application, the situation is that the lumber rates which were at the same time in force on other lines were not put in force here until August 25, 1913.

Does the fact that the mileage in question was operated under the construction department differentiate this mileage from the mileage comprised in other portions of the system and operated by the operating department? Manifestly not. A railway, or portion thereof, is either, on the one hand, not open for traffic, or, on the other hand, it is, under section 261, either open for traffic or given leave to carry traffic. There is no half-way house recognized by the statute; and the order opening the mileage in question puts it in the same position as any other section of the mileage, if the question of discrimination arises.

The railway company has spoken of the difficulties attaching to a temporary service afforded by the construction department. The attempt of the railway company to give a service at the earliest possible moment is laudable. But the praiseworthiness of the attempt affords the board no justification for enlarging the statute.

In the matter of the complaint made by J. W. Lenhart of Mazenod, Sask., File 24688, which was decided on July 20, 1914, the situation developed that the Canadian Northern Railway Company had omitted to give a town tariff from Regina to Mazenod, although it is within Regina's distributing radius. The railway company had included in the Regina town tariff Avonlea and other points on the Moosejaw-Rodney line. It had also covered the line from Radcliffe to Bengough, that is to say, in the case of these town tariff rates which were of general applicability within Regina's distributing radius, Mazenod had not been given the same treatment as other points.

In the present case, the situation is that an unreasonably long time was allowed to elapse before the special lumber rates, which were of general applicability, were made applicable to the mileage in question. The road being opened for traffic, this delay in installing the rates created an unjust discrimination. This is as far, however, as the declaration can go. The board has no power to direct refunds. The rates complained

of as discriminatory have been removed, and with them the cause of complaint has also been removed.

Concurred in by Chief Commissioner Drayton.

APPLICATION OF THE TOWN OF LISTOWEL FOR THE CONSTRUCTION OF AN INTERCHANGE TRACK AT THAT POINT, BETWEEN THE C.P.R. AND THE G.T.R.

Judgment, Assistant Chief Commissioner SCOTT, October 26, 1914.

This is the second time the town of Listowel has applied to the board for the construction of an interchange track between the Canadian Pacific Railway and the Grand Trunk Railway.

The first application, which was made in 1908, was dismissed by order of the Board No. 6673, dated March 26, 1909. The last paragraph of that order reserved to the applicant leave to renew its application at any time if a change in the conditions and circumstances rendered necessary a physical connection between the two railways at Listowel.

The Canadian Pacific Railway station at Listowel was opened for traffic on July 1, 1908. In a statement which they submitted to the board on the first application, the traffic up to December 8, 1908, showed 57 carloads received. In the year 1913, it appears, from the Canadian Pacific Railway statement in the present case that 250 carloads were received over that company's lines at Listowel. Traffic to and from Listowel has undoubtedly increased in recent years; but, the chief circumstance, which was not before the board on the first application and which the town now urges as a reason why its present application should be granted is, that the well known food produce concern of Libby, McNeill & Libby has intimated to the municipality that it will establish a branch of its business in Listowel if interchange between the two railway companies at Listowel is established.

From a statement submitted to the board by his worship the mayor, it appears that in the year 1913, 790 carloads of traffic were handled by thirteen concerns in Listowel. Of this number 531 came from points that were served by both the railways, and 87 cars were teamed to consignee's premises because of lack of interchange facilities at Listowel.

Each railway company has an industrial track at Listowel upon which a number of industries have been located; and, while the industrial track is common to several different industries no difficulty appears to have arisen with regard to the placing or removing of cars at the different factories. The industrial tracks may really be considered as the private sidings of the different industries they serve. Teams are sometimes loaded or unloaded at cars placed on these industrial tracks; but, that is merely an incidental use of the tracks as they are not really team tracks at all.

Were it not for the contemplated establishment of a factory of the Libby, McNeill & Libby concern at Listowel the board would hardly be justified on the existing traffic in granting this application; but, if this food produce concern establishes the factory at Listowel, it is contended that it will at least ship 500 cars; and that, that increase in the traffic would warrant the establishment of an interchange.

At the hearing it was made quite clear that the Libby concern had refused to establish its factory at a place where it could be served by both railways by private siding, because the location was not a suitable one for its purposes. The site decided upon by the Libby Company is adjoining the Grand Trunk. This site possesses special advantage with regard to water, drainage and facilities for the delivery of milk at the factory. The Libby Company refuses to establish in Listowel unless it is to have the advantage of interchange as it contemplates large carload shipments to exclusive points on each railway.

With regard to the physical conditions respecting the constructing of interchange tracks: the board has had the benefit of a report from its engineer which states that at

a point near Reserve street where the tracks of the two companies parallel each other, an interchange track could be easily constructed at a reasonable cost.

The town is most anxious to have this interchange constructed, because it believes that the establishment of the Libby, McNeill & Libby concern in Listowel will be of very great benefit to the town.

I think we might grant the application, on the condition that the interchange track was not to be constructed until the Libby factory was erected; and, on the further condition that the town contribute one-third of the cost of the installation of the interchange. The balance to be divided equally between the two railway companies. When the interchange is established, the general interswitching order of the board will apply to all movements to or from the Industrial tracks of the two railway companies mentioned above.

Commissioner McLean concurred.

Order in accordance with judgment, issued.

APPLICATION OF THE HEPWORTH SILICA PRESSED BRICK COMPANY, LIMITED, OF HEPWORTH, ONTARIO, FOR AN ORDER DIRECTING THE GRAND TRUNK RAILWAY COMPANY TO CONSTRUCT A SPUR TO THE PREMISES OF THE APPLICANT COMPANY AT HEPWORTH, ONTARIO, AND COMPLAINT AGAINST THE SWITCHING CHARGE OF $2 PER CAR PROPOSED TO BE CHARGED BY THE GRAND TRUNK RAILWAY COMPANY.

Judgment, Chief Commissioner DRAYTON, October 28, 1914:

During the course of the hearing, the railway company contended that a rate of $2 per car should be allowed for all cars moved over the switch in question, and argued that, in the absence of such rate, no rebate could be ordered by the board as contemplated by section 226, owing to the fact that there would be no fund out of which the rebate could be paid. At the close of the hearing, my judgment, delivered in brief, was as follows:

> "As I have said, we do not think—perhaps entirely incorrectly, as you submit, Mr. Chisholm—that we can deal with the general question which you really are raising, on a single issue of this kind."
>
> "It would be entirely unfair to start out with a peculiar charge, a new charge as against this particular industry, which has shown no material which is not really challenged by the railway company, that it is entitled to a switch under the provisions of section 226 of the Act. If we did that, we would be according one class of treatment to the rest of the people engaged in the brick business and another to this company."
>
> "On the other hand, nothing which we will do to-day will have anything to do, one way or the other, on a proper application, to prejudice your railway in asking that it shall be allowed a proper switching charge having regard to the length of this particular switch."
>
> "We, therefore, think that an order should be made under section 226, of the Act, that is, the section under which we can compel the construction; and that order, Mr. Walsh, is not an order which deals with the whole cost of construction. In the forced section, that is the only order we can make."
>
> "An order will, therefore, go for the construction under section 226, with a further modification of the terms which the parties have said were discussed: the question as to refund is a matter entirely for the board under that section. This is a comparatively long switch. The traffic moving takes a low rate, so that, under the circumstances, instead of asking the railway company to rebate at the rate of $2 per car, the company will rebate at the rate of $1 per car."

In view of the importance of the issue, fuller reasons for the action of the board should now be given.

The clause under consideration, subsection 3 of section 226, first appeared in the Railway Act, 1903, as section 176, subsection 2. Before the legislation many sidings of the character in question had been installed as matters of agreement between the railway companies and shippers interested. While there may be isolated cases which have been overlooked by the traffic department, the department reports that the tolls which were invariably charged were tolls based upon the transportation service as a whole, without any attempt in any case being made to collect a charge for the so-claimed additional railway service.

The railway practice and the service afforded shippers at the time the legislation in question was enacted, required the construction and operation by companies of freight spurs, sheds, and team tracks, as well as the breaking-up and sorting yards adjacent to the respective terminals. In so far as the breaking-up and sorting yards are concerned, these were necessary for the work of the railway, apart entirely from any direct service to shippers, who, speaking generally, have no access to them either for loading or unloading at such points. The cars being segregated, they are distributed to different points at the terminal to which they are ordered—some of them to team tracks, some to industrial tracks, and others to freight sheds or stock yards. Team tracks and freight sheds have to be provided and maintained by railway companies as part of the necessary facilities they are bound to provide, and they must be reasonably adequate and sufficient. The industrial tracks are in effect substitutes for team tracks in so far as the heavier classes of merchandise are concerned, and they take the place of freight-shed accommodation for the higher grades of merchandise. Their installation, laid as they are upon the property of the shipper, is, therefore, in case of the public team tracks and freight-shed accommodation. Their operation does not of necessity constitute any additional railway service. Apart entirely from the saving that results to the company from its being able to use its own facilities for the purpose of other business, in some cases the actual mechanical operation is cheaper, while in others, of course, owing to the length of the spur, it would be more expensive unless the shorter haul was accompanied with more switching movements. In the same way, the handling of business within a terminal entirely on company-owned facilities varies very much. The Montreal and Toronto terminals cover in their switching area many miles of track. Some deliveries mean a great deal of switching and engine work, while others are attended with a very small cost. In Ottawa, for example, the Grand Trunk has its freight yard and some of its public team tracks at Elgin street. In a movement from Montreal consigned to the Eddy Company, the car must, in the first instance, be taken to this yard and afterwards shipped to the company's public team delivery tracks adjacent to the Eddy works, involving an extra movement of over two miles at the same toll as in the case of a delivery at Elgin street. The switch in question is shown on the plan to be 4,200 feet in length.

Subsection 2 of section 284 is as follows:—

> "Such adequate and suitable accommodation, shall include reasonable facili-
> "ties for the junction of private sidings or private branch railways with any
> "railway belonging to or worked by the company, and reasonable facilities for
> "receiving, forwarding, and delivering traffic upon and from those sidings or
> "private branch railways, together with the placing of cars and moving them
> "upon and from such private sidings and private branch railways."

From this, it will be noted that the duty of placing cars and moving them upon and from private sidings is placed upon the railway company.

It has been held in England that it is only a reasonable facility, that a company should be willing to run over a portion of a foreign line to collect traffic where such line has been conveniently planned for its access to it, and where the company has no reserve line of its own; and where traders had laid down sidings adjoining a railway company's line and had made junctions with that line, with the approval of the company's

engineer, the commissioners considered that, after they had brought their trucks (*sic*, cars), as near to the main line as they could with safety, and had arranged them in proper order, they were entitled to have them taken off by the company without extra payment. The English practice, however, does not seem to be a matter of much importance, owing to the fact that it is based upon an entirely different statute. In England, the cost of the industrial siding does not appear to be repaid; in place of this, the shipper is entitled to receive an allowance or rebate on the traffic moving over his siding, because the railway company does not, in that instance, provide station accommodation or perform terminal services (57 & 58 Victoria, chapter 54, section 4.)

There is not much difficulty in arriving at the amount of the rebate to be allowed, as, under the established railway practice in England, freight rates are divided into two amounts; that charged for the line haul, and the sum of the station terminal rates.

The English statute defining the obligation of the railway company as to the facilities to be furnished with respect to private sidings (4 Edward VII., cap. 19), closely follows the corresponding section in our Act (section 284, subsection 3) except that the statute does not in terms require the railway company to place cars upon and move them from a private siding.

As to the nature of the service, reference may be had to Interstate Commerce et al. vs. Atchison, Topeka, and Sante Fe Railway et al. (Judgment of Supreme Court of the United States delivered June 8, 1914.)

In Canada railway companies' tariffs include not only the line haul rate from destination to destination, but also cover the railway services in receiving and delivering merchandise at team tracks or in freight sheds expressed in a lump sum.

The result of a special charge for working the substituted facility, which, as already pointed out, may or may not be more expensive, would in effect—at least in many instances—be a direct increase in the transportation charge.

In the case of Grand Trunk Railway Company v. Christie, Henderson, & Co. (9 C.R.C. 502), at the time the switch was ordered, provision was made for the payment of a switching charge of $3 per car. At a hearing, the railway company relied on an order made in the case of the Pilon spur on the Canada Atlantic Railway, and, in a reserved judgment delivered by the late Chief Commissioner, the Honourable Mr. Justice Mabee, it is stated that:—

> "When the board made the order requiring the company to put this spur in, a provision was made for the payment of a switching charge; but there was then no information furnished to the board that it had been the custom of the company for many years to perform the like service without making an extra charge,—the law requires all to be treated alike, and it is absurd for the board to require Messrs. Christie, Henderson & Co. to make payments for services that the railway company makes no charge for at other industrial plants."

The length of the haul in the Pilon case was two and a half miles from the station; and, by a later judgment of the board, the switching charge complained of by Pilon was disallowed (Pilon v. Grand Trunk Railway Company, 16 C.R.C. 433).

These decisions do not mean that railway companies are not entitled to collect the full mileage rate, but simply that an arbitrary charge shall not be made as against "A", while, under similar circumstances, no such charge is made against "B".

As a matter of fact, however, in the case of these comparatively outlying spurs, the exact mileage rate is often not of real importance.

Brick, the merchandise manufactured by the applicants, always moves under commodity tariffs. Such tariffs are as a rule put in voluntarily by the railway companies, on the application of manufacturers and are made from the point of manufacture to points towards which business moves in sufficient quantity to justify the making of special rates.

Since the hearing, on June 19, the Grand Trunk Railway Company issued Supplement 209 to C.R.C. No. E-2552, effective June 30, 1914. This tariff, among other rates, gave a commodity rate of 6½ cents per 100 pounds on building brick (except enamelled or glazed) from Hepworth, where the applicant's factory is situate, to Toronto, and one of 12½ cents from Hepworth to Montreal; and, on September 17, 1914, the said company issued supplement 248 to C.R.C. No. E.-2552, giving a commodity rate of 7 cents per 100 pounds on building brick (except enamelled or glazed) from Hepworth to Waterloo,—the said tariff to become effective September 21, 1914.

In voluntarily making these tariffs the railway company undoubtedly thought that the rates, which are but slightly related to the mileage rate, were necessary in order to create traffic for its lines, or else that in view of commodity rates already granted by it to other brick manufacturers, the neglect to extend them in these cases would constitute an unlawful discrimination.

The result is that the railway company may be driven to attempt to make a special charge for services on spurs of the class in question. The merits of such a charge can properly be passed on only after appropriate tariffs have been filed, and the different interests involved have been heard by the board.

The practice of the board, therefore, as well as the practice of the railway companies, since the section in question was enacted, is similar to the practice of the railway companies before that time. The section itself reads as follows:

> "The aggregate amount so paid by the applicant in the construction and completion of the said spur or branch line shall be repaid or refunded to the applicant by the company by way of rebate, to be determined and fixed by the board, out of or in proportion to the tolls charged by the company in respect of the carriage of traffic for the applicant over the said spur or branch line."

The board has construed this section in the past as obligatory, and has, therefore, invariably ordered refunds to be made as contemplated. These refunds have varied from time to time and have been based upon a percentage of the earnings, or more frequently upon a direct allowance per car,—a refund at the rate of $2 a car being perhaps the usual practice. Mr. Chisholm's contention, if correct, would abolish all refunds. His argument in short is that, unless the board allows a special charge to be made for the carriage of traffic over the spur, in addition to that chargeable under the tariffs already in effect, there is no fund from which the rebate can be made. I have been unable to find that the point has ever before been taken. There is no reported case on the subject, nor have I been able to find any unreported case on the board's files. The question is dealt with in McMurchy & Denison's work on Railway Law, second edition, page 281, as follows:—

> "the expense to be repaid to the owner by allowing a rebate upon the freight charges due in respect of every car of freight shipped in or out upon the siding." ....."

Under the provisions of the Railway Act, tariffs of all railway tolls have, in the first instance, to be filed by the railway companies; and none covering services on a private spur has yet been filed. As has already been pointed out, this practice has not obtained; a charge has not been made and was not made at the time the legislation was enacted. The result is that if the right to rebate is limited to cases where a toll is charged for the movement on the spur, the provision as to rebate is entirely idle, and in-operative, and of no effect. Bound, as I am under the authorities, to give effect to the statute, if the wording thereof admits of such a course, I find that the right to rebate is not thus limited, and that the effect of the statute is only to limit rebates to freight charges due on cars which have passed over the spur in question, with the right to the board to order rebates either in proportion to the amount of the tolls charged or by a fixed charge per car. The limitation, if I may say so, is also

reasonable and proper. Large plants frequently have different methods of getting their produce in and out, and it would be entirely unfair to compel a railway company to rebate to such an industrial concern the cost of a spur which it might never use.

I am of the opinion that the object of the statute was to compel railway companies to furnish the facility, instead of leaving the construction of spurs entirely to the discretion of the companies under the section requiring them to place all traders on an equal basis—the basis of those already favoured; and this basis was, as pointed out, not subject to any special or arbitrary charge for the use of the spur. While effecting this object, Parliament protected the carrier; for, if it turns out that there was not sufficient business to warrant the construction of a spur and that traffic does not move over the spur after construction the loss is on the trader and not on the carrier.

Assistant Chief Com. Scott and Commissioner McLean concurred.

AN APPLICATION BY THE CITY OF FORT WILLIAM, ONT., FOR AN ORDER DIRECTING THE CANADIAN PACIFIC RAILWAY COMPANY TO PROVIDE A SPUR FROM ITS MAIN LINE, FORT WILLIAM, ALONG NEEBING AVENUE, CROSSING THE CANADIAN NORTHERN RAILWAY AT GRADE, AND THE STREET RAILWAY AND THE HIGHWAY ON MONTREAL STREET, SO AS TO CONNECT WITH A SPUR TO INDUSTRIES OF APPLICANT. ALSO FOR AN ORDER ALLOWING THE CONSTRUCTION OF THE SPUR ACROSS THE GRAND TRUNK PACIFIC BRANCH LINE ON MONTREAL STREET.

Judgment, Chief Commissioner DRAYTON, October 28, 1914.

The order under which the spur in question was constructed was made on the application of the city of Fort William, under sections 226 and 227 of the Act.

Under these circumstances, the cost of construction must be borne by the applicant. The board had no jurisdiction to order construction any other way, unless upon an application by the company itself under section 222.

The usual estimate as to the cost of construction was made by an officer of the board, his estimate calling for $4,700. This amount of money was paid into a bank by the applicant and the construction was proceeded with; but unfortunately the cost exceeded the estimate by $2,103.91.

The company subsequently applied to the board for an order directing the applicant to pay to the company the said sum of $2,103.91; and judgment was reserved, in order that the whole question might be looked into carefully by the board's engineers. An engineer has since reported that the amount charged for the work done is reasonable and should be paid.

The result is, of course, unfortunate. An estimate deliberately made should always if possible cover the ultimate cost of construction. At the same time, it is just as important to an applicant that the estimate should not be over as that it should not be under the probable cost. If, in order to be on the safe side, an estimate is made much in excess of the actual cost, the difficulty of obtaining a desired facility is aggravated.

In this particular case, the estimate was only for the cost of the construction of the spur. It was entirely an estimate of that construction, apart from the interlocker protection which it has been found necessary to install.

It may be said that, in the first instance, the estimate should have covered the cost of necessary protection, even though at that time no interlocker had actually been ordered. Possibly so; but it may be added that the applicant has not been damaged by not knowing that the work, so necessary and important to it, would cost upwards of $7,000, instead of $4,700; and it is proper to observe that it has saved some interest on the extra money required.

Further, it may be noted that, under the section, the estimate is merely an estimate; it does not fix the ultimate liability of the parties, one way or the other. If it is excessive, the applicant gets a refund. If, on the other hand, for some special reason,

as in this case, or if, during the course of construction the discovery of a quicksand pit or anything of that character prove the estimate to be entirely too small, the liability of the applicant still exists. The scheme of the statute is that the cost of the industrial spur which the applicant desires shall, in the first instance, be thrown upon him, and not upon the company; and the order in this case, as in all such cases, provides that if any dispute arises as to the construction or operation of the spur, or as to the expense thereof, the dispute shall be referred to the board; and that, in the event of the work costing more or less than the sum estimated, the difference shall be adjusted by the board. So, under the terms of the statute, we have no alternative, we have simply to direct payment by the applicant of this additional sum of $2,103.91.

I pointed out, at the hearing, that as all this cost had to be rebated out of tolls charged for traffic over the spur, the company might well forego its claim for the payment of the additional sum. This, however, the company has declined to do; and upon its insisting on its rights, the section entitles it to the payment of the amount mentioned above.

Commissioner Goodeve concurred.

Order issued, directing applicants to pay *pro rata* to the Canadian Pacific Railway company the additional sum of $2,103.91; the Canadian Pacific Railway Company to repay or refund to the industry owners, or their assigns, by way of rebate, one-half the tolls charged by the said railway company in respect of the carriage of traffic over the said spur, until the said additional sum of $2,103.91 has been repaid by the railway company to the said industry owners, or their assigns.

COMPLAINT BY THE CITIES OF VANCOUVER AND NORTH VANCOUVER, B.C., AGAINST THE CHANGE OF PLANS OF THE NORTH VANCOUVER FERRY PEDESTRIAN SUBWAY BY THE CANADIAN PACIFIC RAILWAY COMPANY.

Judgment, Chief Commissioner Drayton, October 29, 1914.

The cities of Vancouver and North Vancouver protested against the manner in which the Canadian Pacific Railway Company had done the work of the construction of the subway in question. It was charged that the plans had been altered after they had been approved of by the company and the contract had been let; that the work had been made extravagantly and quite unnecessarily expensive; and it was urged that the sum of $1,100 should be deducted from the part of the cost which the municipalities have to pay, and be borne entirely by the railway company.

At the hearing, the board was of the opinion that, if the matters which the cities complained of as unnecessary, not being covered by any plan, were merely details involved in the working out of the contract, such as would be covered by the usual clauses as to extras unavoidable in a work of that kind, the work should be considered such as was contemplated by the original order, and the application should be dismissed. If, however, the changes were of moment—such as amounted to an unauthorized method of construction, the whole cost should be borne by the railway company.

The complaint was referred to one of the board's assistant engineers, Mr. Kerr, of Calgary, to take up with the engineers of the parties—to go over the plans and the work with them, in order to establish clearly and definitely what changes, if any, had been made in the plans and were protested against by the applicants.

Mr. Kerr's report was furnished to the parties interested as far back as July 21, 1914; and they were asked to make thereon such comments or suggestions as they might think proper; but, so far, nothing has been received, except a recent suggestion by the applicants that the board issue an order on Mr. Kerr's report, which report is as follows:—

> "At the board's hearing held in Vancouver on June 10, the chief commissioner instructed me to go over these plans and let him know exactly what these

changes are and exactly whether the changes which have taken place are changes of the character which should have been provided by a proper detailed plan, and which should and would in the ordinary course have been covered by and checked by the railway company before the contract was signed, or whether these are changes of a subsequent character of which I mention something only of necessity incidental to the carrying out of a work of this kind.

"I have indicated in the attached blue print the changes that have taken place. The plan approved of in August, 1913, indicated the general type of the structure which the company would be agreeable to have the city construct under its tracks, at the same time reserving the right to approve the bridge company's detailed plans and make any change deemed advisable, which is the recognized practice. The city awarded the contract for the steel work to the Canadian Northwest Steel Company, Vancouver. Detailed plans for fabrication purposes were prepared by this company and handed to the railway company for approval. The railway company made some small revision in these details to bring them in line with their standard practice, and the changes that were made were changes of a character incidental to the carrying out of a work of this nature. The changes comprise the substitution of plate diaphragms at the end of the I-beams for channel diaphragms as indicated in red on the attached blue print (see plan of floor). Another addition was made by the railway company for having placed an inverted angle on upper flange of the plate girder on each side of the bridge, shown in red, section C.C. The cost of these additions should be paid by the railway company and is provided for in the schedule of extra prices, page 2 in the contract between the city and the contractor, being item 1, structural steel ·06½ cents per pound erected (copy of contract attached), amounting in all for extras to $168.22.

"Claim for extra riveting alterations of rivet pitch from a wide to a close spacing in the floor plates. The approved of general plans show there is no change in this.

"The only point in the general approved of plan where close spacing is required is on the shelf angle on the facia, or ballast girder, and it is even more important to have this close spacing where floor plates splice on I-beam, as the floor plate is partly depended upon to distribute the live load transversely over the requisite number of I-beams required to carry each track. It is necessary that where it is spliced over an I-beam the rivets connecting it to that I-beam be at close pitch, while at intermediate I-beams close riveting would not be necessary. These plates being 2 feet 6 inches wide by over 30 feet long, were placed longitudinally with the tracks, which required them to splice at each alternative I-beam (as the I-beams are 15-inch centres), thereby requiring two rows of close-spaced rivets at every alternate I-beam.

"The railway company had nothing to do with the deciding on the width of these plates. If the bridge company chose to use a plate 2 feet 6 inches wide by 30 feet long, they had a perfect right to do so. The railway company also had the right to see that a sufficient number of rivets were put in at these splices to give them the results they required. By adopting plates 5 feet wide or 7 feet 6 inches, the splices required for the former width would have been over every fourth I-beam and for the latter over every sixth I-beam, thereby requiring one-half the rivets (in the former case), and one-third the number (in the latter case), of the close-spaced rivet lines required by the width of the plates employed. Placing these plates transversely with the track, the number of lines of close-spaced rivets would have been reduced to a minimum. This, of course, was out of the question, as all the tracks would have to be lifted, consequently closing up traffic which would have been costly to the city.

"Therefore, by laying the ballast plates longitudinally with the track, one track would only be obstructed for a time.

"Under these circumstances, I do not see where the railway company has any right to pay for the extra riveting as charged, wholly brought about by the bridge company adopting a narrow plate."

Mr. Mountain, the board's chief engineer, whose duty is to pass upon the reports of the assistant engineers, states:—

"I concur in all Mr. Kerr's report, except the paragraph in which he suggests charging the Canadian Pacific Railway Company $168. This is what is known as an inverted angle. It has nothing to do directly with the strength of the bridge, but has to do with the waterproof floor by preventing moisture from getting in behind it on the inside facing of the girder. It is used by the Canadian Pacific Railway Company on a modern structure similar to this, crossing Aqueduct street in Montreal, and the plans were approved by the board's chief engineer and I approve it here, and do not think the charge should be upon the Canadian Pacific Railway Company at all, but on the city. I agree that the riveting is quite proper and it should be charged to the city. I carried on the correspondence with the engineers in connection with this matter, and I urged the Canadian Pacific Railway Company's engineer to hurry up the details. These details are checked up by Bridge Engineer Motely in Montreal and this structure was in the other side of the country in Vancouver, and he naturally had some correspondence with the division engineer at that point, which would account for some of the delay. Under the order, I do not think any part of this is chargeable to the Canadian Pacific Railway Company."

The whole question is reduced to an item of $168.22, which Mr. Kerr thinks should be paid and which Mr. Mountain thinks should not be paid by the railway company. In this connection, it may be stated that Mr. Mountain had knowledge of the details and the approval of the plan, with which he had directly to do, as also of the practice which obtains in work of this kind at other points. I find, as a matter of fact, that the railway company, in the construction of other works over highways where the whole cost is on the company—as in the case of new works over a highway—use the same kind of construction as was used in this case. The extra in question is not for work of special importance to the railway company as such, but for work which will make the structure more serviceable to those who use the subway—done with a view to make the waterproofing of the superstructure more efficient, and add to its durability.

The work complained of is in character merely a detail, and one which was not introduced by the railway company with a view to its own advantage, but really in the interest of those who use the subway; and, under these circumstances, I am of the opinion that, on this application, no order should be made against the company.

Commissioner Goodeve concurred.

Order dismissing complaint issued.

PARK AVENUE CROSSING, OVER THE CANADIAN PACIFIC RAILWAY COMPANY'S TRACKS, MONTREAL.

Judgment, Assistant Chief Commissioner SCOTT, November 9, 1914:

The city of Montreal has applied to the board for an order declaring that the way of communication used as a means of access at Park avenue, between territory of the city of Montreal north west of the line of the railway company between Atlantic avenue and Beaumont avenue, and the territory southeast of the railway, is a public highway crossing over the said right of way of the railway company.

Since the hearing, Commissioner McLean and I who heard this matter have had an opportunity of visiting the location on the ground. There is little dispute between the city and the railway company as to the facts. The crossing in question was a farm crossing originally. It has been used by the public for a period of time varying in the opinion of the different witnesses from 10 to 18 years. It is now heavily travelled. A statement submitted, showed 1,811 pedestrians, 1,718 vehicles, and 32 engines passed over the crossing in a period of twelve hours. At one time there was a gate at the crossing and it was sometimes closed by the railway company, although not at frequent periods. The gate posts are still standing. The space for vehicles between the posts is about 10 feet. This feature of the crossing makes it resemble a farm crossing more than a public highway crossing. The fences are not return, and there are no cattle guards as at highway crossings. There are no highway crossing signs. The public who have been crossing at this point have been trespassers upon the railway company's property, or mere licensees at best.

It has been decided by this board on a number of occasions, that to fix a railway company with a portion of the cost of constructing a highway crossing over the railway in accordance with the board's specifications, or of protecting the crossing that there must be some act on the part of the railway company which might be taken as a dedication of a highway crossing to the public.

In the case of the Village of Weston *vs.* C.P.R. and G.T.R., 7 Canadian Railway Cases, page 79, Judge Killam, on facts very similar to those found in this case, put all the cost on the municipality of converting an illegal level crossing into a legal highway crossing.

In the case of Royce avenue, Toronto, which is found in the proceedings of this board, volume 107, at page 6746, Judge Mabee in distinguishing that case from the Weston case just referred to, used the following language:—

> "Now in that case (The Weston Case) the public who were using that portion of the ground that was contended as being a highway, were mere licensees at best; possibly they were trespassers. The railway companies did everything they could to prevent any inference of intention to dedicate that portion of their lands to public use as a highway crossing. Now the facts in this case are that no matter what may have been the position prior to 1884, on the 9th of June the Canadian Pacific Railway Company with the Clarks entered into an agreement whereby they agreed to open, or rather to widen an existing crossing known as the Laughton crossing over their tracks from 33 to 66 feet wide, by dedicating—although that word is not used in the agreement it must have been by dedicating—the adjacent 33 feet to be added to that 33-foot crossing in order to make a 66-foot crossing at that point. In the month of November of the same year the Grand Trunk practically did the same thing over their railway lands. By virtue of these two agreements then in 1884 the persons in that vicinity obtained the right to cross over the lands of the Grand Trunk Railway Company and the Canadian Pacific Railway Company from the southern terminus of where it was intended to locate Royce avenue to the street known as Dundas street on the other side of the track. Now unlike the Weston Case, here the railway companies in 1884, 28 years ago, did everything they could to convey this property to the public for a highway crossing."

In the present case there has been no such dedication by the railway company and there is no legal highway crossing at the point in question. The crossing is heavily travelled, and it should be made a legal highway crossing and it should be protected. No portion of the cost should be put on the railway company.

All parties seem to agree that there should be gates with night and day watchmen to protect this crossing, when it is made to comply with the specifications of the board.

An order should go authorizing the municipality to open Park avenue across the tracks of the railway company; on condition that the crossing be protected by gates, with night and day watchmen.

While, as I have pointed out, nothing has been done at this crossing which would fix the railway company with responsibility which would warrant us in placing a portion of the cost of protection on it; nevertheless, it is a way of communication under the Act. The public are using it and it should be made safe for that purpose. It was a way of communication in existence prior to the first day of April, 1909. Therefore, a contribution of 20 per cent of the cost of the construction of a proper crossing and the gates to protect it, can be made out of The Railway Grade Crossing Fund. The rest of the expense must be borne by the municipality.

In giving a contribution out of The Railway Grade Crossing Fund in this case, we are following the decision of the board in the case of Simplex avenue, town of St. Pierre, P. Q., (File 4813). Judge Mabee's judgment in that case is to be found in the printed volume of judgments of the board, for the year 1911, at page 192.

Concurred in by Mr. Commissioner McLean.

APPLICATION OF THE CANADIAN NORTHERN ONTARIO RY. CO., TO CONSTRUCT THE LINES AND TRACKS OF PROPOSED JOINT SECTION WITH THE CAMPBELLFORD, LAKE ONTARIO AND WESTERN RY. CO., ACROSS FRONT AND PINNACLE STREETS IN THE CITY OF BELLEVILLE, ONT., AND TO DIVERT THE TRAFFIC WHERE SAID LINES CROSS WATER STREET VIA JAMES AND DUNDAS STREETS.

APPLICATION OF THE C.L.O. & W. RY. CO., UNDER SECTIONS 178, 222 AND 237, FOR AUTHORITY TO EXPROPRIATE CERTAIN LANDS IN THE CITY OF BELLEVILLE, ONT., FOR THE PURPOSE OF ESTABLISHING COMPANY'S TEAM YARDS, AND FOR AUTHORITY TO CLOSE DUNDAS STREET BETWEEN NORFOLK AND KING STREETS AND DIVERT IT TO BROOK STREET BY WAY OF NORFOLK AND WILLARD STREETS, AND TO CLOSE MARY AND JAMES STREETS BETWEEN THE NORTHERN LIMIT OF DUNDAS STREET AND THE SOUTHERN LIMIT OF THE RIGHT OF WAY OF THE C.N.O.R., AND TO DIVERT THE TRAFFIC ON SAME BY MEANS OF A GRADE LEVEL HIGHWAY CROSSING IN THE VICINITY OF THE INTERSECTION OF KING AND WATER STREETS, AS INDICATED ON THE PLAN.

APPLICATION OF THE CITY OF BELLEVILLE, ONT., PER J. W. EVANS THAT THE BOARD RE-OPEN AND RE-CONSIDER ALL THE QUESTIONS INVOLVED IN THE GRADE CROSSINGS OF STREETS, BY THE LINE OF THE C.N.O. RY., AND THE LINE OF THE C.L.O. & W. RY.

Judgment, Mr. Commissioner McLean, November 11, 1914:

On the 1st of May, 1913, there was heard in the city of Belleville an application of the Campbellford, Lake Ontario & Western Railway Company to approve a certain portion of its location.

On the same date, viz., May 1, 1913, at the same place, there was heard the application of the Campbellford, Lake Ontario & Western Railway Company for authority to construct a bridge over the Moira river at Belleville; and, thereafter, under date of August 7, 1915, Order No. 19964 issued, authorizing the construction of the bridge, in accordance with plan No. 49783 on file with the board under file No. 3701·245.

On the same date, there was also heard, at the same place an application of certain ratepayers, on behalf of the Corporation of the city of Belleville, for an order directing as follows:

> "That the present Canadian Northern Ontario Railway Company's bridge across the Moira river be raised at least four feet, and that there be made on Front street a subway having at least eleven feet clear in height; (2) that the crossing on Pinnacle street be a level crossing, paved on each side; and that the grade leading up to the crossing do not exceed two per cent; (3) that Church

street remain open and that a level crossing be maintained there; and that the grade on each side of the track be not more than a two per cent grade on the roadway; (4) that an overhead bridge, not only for foot-passengers but for drays besides, be built on George street across the tracks of the said railways, the north end of such bridge and approach thereto, or any bridge that may be built, to extend northerly on George street so as to have as easy a rise from the said George street road up the incline and over the top of the said bridge; (5) that Newberry street be made straight and that the tracks be kept clear at this point; and that this street be of the width of sixty-six feet and be well ditched and well made and of the best possible grade; (6) that Foster street be provided with a proper crossing with all safeguards; (7) that provision for the opening of Dufferin street be made; (8) on the west side of the river Moira a subway should be built at the foot of James street for the use of those occupying the sheds and factory to the south and the other lands which are considerable in extent and suitable for factory purposes; (9) that there should be at the foot of Mary street an opening under the said tracks to permit the city waterworks to place a main thereon so as to be able to have a hydrant on or near the property now occupied; and (10) there should be provision for a level crossing at what is known as the Bridge Road; and that the grade on each side of the said road should not exceed two per cent."

Following this, reasons for judgment were issued on July 25, 1913, and Order No. 20609, of October 15, 1913, based on these reasons issued. This order provided in clause 2 of the operative portion thereof that the application by the city to lay a water pipe under the tracks of the Canadian Northern Ontario Railway Company at the foot of Mary street should be authorized, and provided in clause 3 thereof that the rest of the application on behalf of the city be, and it is hereby, refused.

This order also approved the location of the Campbellford, Lake Ontario & Western Railway through Belleville, subject to what had already been done under Order No. 19651.

Under date of February 12, 1914, application was made by the Canadian Northern Ontario Railway Company for authority to construct the lines and tracks of the proposed joint section of the Campbellford, Lake Ontario & Western Railway Company across Front and Pinnacle streets, in the city of Belleville, and to divert the traffic where the said lines cross Water street via James and Dundas streets.

In answer to this application, the city, under date of February 25, 1914, in filing its answer, made certain specific suggestions which it considered would more adequately take care of the general traffic and highway situation in the city of Belleville.

1st. "We propose that Newbury street be closed.

2nd. "We propose that George street be closed as a level crossing and that an overhead bridge be built which will take care of all traffic over the tracks. This is an important highway, and will be much more so as the factories and industries increase on the land tributary to this street.

3rd. "We propose that John street be closed.

4th. "We propose that Church street be closed. The closing of John and Church streets will enable the railways to extend their station platform to the required length, and to provide adequate station facilities.

5th. "Pinnacle street will have to remain as a level crossing protected by gates.

6th. "At Front street, which is the most important connection between the city and the Harbour and provides access to all the land south of the tracks, it is in our opinion absolutely necessary that an adequate under-crossing be provided with a roadway at least 30 feet wide, with two sidewalks each six feet wide.

7th. "The proposed new roadway from John street to Pinnacle street should be extended to Front street so that the traffic may follow safely through the subway on Front street towards the north.

8th. "That part of the city lying west of the river should be provided with similar safeguards and an undercrossing 24 feet wide should be provided at James street to ensure safety to the public."

Under date of July 20, 1914, an application was filed by the Campbellford, Lake Ontario & Western Railway Company to take, without the consent of the owners, certain lands in the city of Belleville, it being alleged that these lands were required in connection with the establishment of the applicant company's team yards. There was also contained in the same application request for authority to close Dundas street between Norfolk and King streets, and divert it to Brock street by way of Norfolk and Willard streets, and the connection to be opened between the same as indicated in red upon the said plan. Also to close Mary and James streets between the northern limit of Dundas street and the southern limit of the right of way of the Canadian Northern Ontario Railway, and to divert the traffic on same by means of a grade level highway crossing in the vicinity of the intersection of King and Water streets, as indicated approximately in red upon the said plan.

Under date of July 14, 1914, the board was informed by the mayor of Belleville that the city being interested both in the application of the Campbellford, Lake Ontario & Western Railway Company and the Canadian Northern Ontario Railway Company, desired, with the view of suiting the convenience of the Council, to arrange a date for hearing at the end of July or beginning of August.

The application of the Campbellford, Lake Ontario & Western Railway Company was set down for hearing on July 29. The submissions made by the city showed that the Canadian Northern Ontario Railway Company was affected; and so, by consent, the matter stood until August 4 to permit the Canadian Northern and Grand Trunk, which was also concerned in the matter, being heard. To suit the convenience of some of those concerned, the matter stood over until August 7. It was then heard.

The application launched by the Canadian Northern Ontario Railway Company was not proceeded with. When the application of the Campbellford, Lake Ontario & Western Railway Company was placed before the board in formal hearing, the city at the same time claimed the right to develop the details of its scheme above set out in regard to the improving of the highway and general traffic conditions within the city of Belleville. No objection was taken by the city to the application of the railway company to take, without the consent of the owners, certain portions of property; but the city stated that the proposition of the railway company to create a level crossing (later to be referred to) tied the whole question up with what was being proposed as to the improvement of the general crossing situation; and it was stated frankly that the city considered, in view of the requests that were made by the railway company, that this was an opportune time to combine with the consideration of the railway company's application the request of the city. The railway company took the position that its application should stand on its own merits; but, as a matter of convenience, the two applications were considered together.

The application of the city may be dealt with first; although on account of the level crossing involved in the application of the Campbellford, Lake Ontario & Western Railway Company, it is impossible to keep the discussion of the two matters entirely distinct.

The answer of the city with reference to the application of the Canadian Northern Ontario Railway Company and of the Campbellford, Lake Ontario & Western Railway Company, already referred to, sets out, under seal, that "it is our desire to make application to your board to re-open and reconsider all of the questions involved in the grade crossings of the streets by the line of the Canadian Northern Ontario Railway." This being so, the question arises, what new and material facts

not before the board when it gave judgment under date of July 25, 1913, are now adduced?

A comparison of the former application and of what is now before the board will bring out the new arrangements, if any, to which the board is asked to direct its attention.

1. The present application involves raising the bridge over the Moira river 3 feet. The former application involved a minimum lift of 4 feet.

2. The present application asks for a subway at Front street and that the roadway be at least 30 feet wide, with two sidewalks each 6 feet wide. The subway asked for is 12 feet clear in height. The former application asked for a subway at this point of at least 11 feet in height.

3. The present application asks for a subway 24 feet wide at James street. This subway is to be 12 feet in height. The former application also asked for a subway at James street.

4. The present application proposes that Newbury street be closed. The former application proposed that it be made straight, and that it should be of the width of 66 feet, be well ditched, be well made, and of the best possible grade.

5. The present application suggests that George street be closed as a level crossing, and that a bridge both for pedestrian and vehicular traffic be provided. The former application also requested that a bridge for pedestrian and vehicular traffic should be provided.

6. The present application proposes that John street be closed. This was not involved in the former application.

7. The present application proposes that Church street be closed. In the former application it was requested that this street be left open, and that a level crossing be maintained at this point with not more than 2 per cent grade on the roadway.

8. In the present application, Pinnacle street is to remain as a level crossing, protected by gates. A level crossing at Pinnacle street was involved in the former application. The differences as between the present and former applications will be developed later.

9. A new roadway from John street to Pinnacle street to be extended to Front street so that the traffic may follow safely through the subway on Front street towards the north, is asked for in the present application. This was not involved in the former application.

To summarize the material, the main points which are involved in the present application and which were not before the board in the former application are——

1. The closing of Newbury street.

2. The closing of John street.

3. The closing of Church street.

4. The construction of a roadway from John street to Pinnacle street on to Front street to take care of the traffic going through the proposed subway.

5. The diversion, by the city, from the Bay Bridge road from a point south of the railway, along the marsh, and along Water street to the proposed subway at or near James street.

In addition to the one-foot difference in level proposed for the bridge as between the present and former application, certain other points of difference are to be mentioned. What the city is prepared to do by way of closing streets has been indicated. In connection with its application for a bridge at George street, it is prepared to take a bridge with approaches of a 10 per cent grade, and to take care of the land damages consequent upon the construction of the bridge. It is willing to take this 10 per cent grade with a view to lessening land damages. As to the level crossing at Pinnacle street, the present application involves, as checked up by the board's engineer, a lift of 2·8 feet in the Grand Trunk tracks at the point of crossing. The city sets out it is

willing to level up the street to this new level of the tracks, and to meet any land damages consequent upon this re-alignment of the surface of the street.

There was at first as between the estimates of cost of the Campbellford, Lake Ontario and Western Railway Company and of the city, a very wide margin, the city's estimate being in round numbers $62,000, and the railway company's estimate being $147,000. Afterwards when it was made clear to the railway company what was involved in the city's willingness to assume land damages the railway company, by deducting this, arrived at a corrected figure of $95,000. The matter has been further checked by the board's engineer, who gives a summary statement as follows:—

Estimate No. 1, George street crossing	$24,527 25
Estimate No. 2, raising Pinnacle street	6,000 00
Estimate No. 3, Front Street subway	20,032 00
Estimate No. 4, Water Street subway	12,083 50
Estimate No. 5, raising of bridges and tracks, and filling in of three easterly spans	23,189 00
	$85,831 75

In presenting the case for the city on July 29 and August 7, various statements were made by Mr. Porter, counsel for the city, as summarizing the reasons why, in his opinion, a re-hearing should be granted. This may be put in a summary way. The references are to volume 208 of the evidence.

At page 4453 he stated that in the former application the question of maintaining a level crossing or of making a subway at Front street was temporarily dealt with.

Again at page 4540, Mr. Porter says, "The judgment itself says it is under the present or existing conditions, and it was clearly stated that if the conditions altered we could always come back to the board."

At pages 4454 and 4455, he contended that the coming in of the Campbellford, Lake Ontario & Western Railway to use the Canadian Northern Ontario Railway Company's tracks in the city of Belleville created an entirely different situation from what was contemplated under the understanding between the city and the Canadian Northern Ontario Railway Company, which was referred to in the board's judgment.

He again stated at pages 4541, 4542 and 4544, that the coming of the Campbellford Lake Ontario and Western Railway created a changed condition.

At pages 4544 and 4545, he says that there was a misapprehension by the board as to the water conditions existing. He now states in substance that it is only under abnormal circumstances that there will be water in the subway, and that in nine years out of ten there was no water at all; and, in a summary way, he stated at page 4497, the same position being taken by Mr. Wills, the mayor of Belleville; at page 4464, that there had been a misapprehension as to the information before the board at the time of the hearing.

To summarize, the grounds for re-hearing advanced are:—

(1) That the coming of the Campbellford, Lake Ontario and Western Railway created a different set of facts, not only in respect of traffic but also of the obligations, if any, imposed upon the city by the unexecuted agreement between it and the Canadian Northern Ontario Railway Company.

(2) That there was erroneous information before the board both as to the water levels and as to cost of proposed works.

(3) That there was a specific reservation of the right of the city to bring up the matter again.

This summary of reasons for a re-hearing may now be dealt with.

The judgment of the board of July 25, 1913, sets out in detail the situation in connection with the location of the Campbellford, Lake Ontario & Western Railway Company. It is pointed out that the original location which was not opposed by the

city council and which was approved by the board after formal hearing provided for a situation which created dangerous features in respect of highway traffic, as well as increasing damage to property. That thereafter, on the reports of the board's officers, and with a view to improving the situation from the standpoint of public convenience, an arrangement was brought about whereby the Campbellford, Lake Ontario and Western Railway was in the section involved in the present application, to run over the tracks of the Canadian Northern Ontario Railway.

The judgment then referred to the application of the C. L. O. & W. R. Co., for approval of its location in this respect, and used the following language:

> "The present application of the C. L. O. & W. R. Co., is for approval of plan showing the road practically on the right of way of the Canadian Northern, within the city limits. To my mind, there is no question whatever as to the advisibility of approving of this location in the interests of the city of Belleville as well as in the interest of traffic conditions generally."

It is to be noted that at the hearing in Belleville, when the application of the C. L. O. & W. R. Co. was before the board as to this location, it appears from the notes of evidence, volume 175, p. 2956, that the mayor of the city of Belleville took part in the discussion in regard to this and other phases of the situation involved in the location through Belleville.

Following this, Order No. 20609 issued. This order dealt both with the points in the city's application and with the approval of the revised location of the C. L. O. & W. R. Co. The city was cognizant of what was being done. The relocation was considered by the board to be in the public interest. It was formally approved; and in issuing judgment and order in the matter the board was seized of the fact that there was to be super-imposed upon the right of way of the C. N. O. R. within a defined section of the city of Belleville, the additional service resulting from the movement of the traffic of the C. L. O. and W. R. Co.

Water levels and cost. The question of cost is referred to and it is stated that the costs as worked out were too high. The judgment of the chief commissioner indicates that cost was only one of the factors. As already indicated, the cost of the present works proposed, which are on a more extensive scale is still higher. The city estimates the cost at about $62,000, the C. L. O. & W. R. Co. at $95,000, and the board's engineer, after careful check of the details involved, at approximately $85,000.

As indicated in the judgment, in dealing with the question of water levels, there was at first some doubt as to the exact meaning of high water level as used in evidence. It was ascertained that high water level, as set out in the plan submitted by Mr. Evans, engineer of the city of Belleville, dealt with the ordinary summer level, and that this was distinct from the flood level. The situation has been checked from the plan by the board's chief engineer, who advises as follows:—

> "In reference to the high water mark at the Moira river at Belleville, there seems to be some difference in the question of the elevation of this high water mark. It is given by the city of Belleville on a profile, signed by city engineer Evans, at 244.97. I have used 245, which is only three-hundredths difference from the city's elevation, which, of course, is no difference whatever."
>
> "The C. P. R. gives the highest water level on record at 246·2, and I am informed that there has been a record of 246 sometime during the last ten years. I notice in White's Altitudes we find the mean level of Lake Ontario, from 1871 to 1900, at 245·7, and the extreme high water 1870, at 248·7. Now, the elevation of the base of rail of the bridges is 255:75. The C. P. R. apparently allow 1½ for cross girder construction but I think that probably 1 foot 3 inches would be not unreasonable, so that, taking the elevation of rail at 255·75 deducting 1·25 for underneath girders, leaves 254·50; taking 11 feet of a subway, which I first

contemplated, would leave 243·50, or 1½ feet below the level of the city's high water, or 2½ feet below the highest record given by the C. P. R. If you take Mr. White's mean water level of 245·7, which is about the mean between these differences, the bottom of the subway would then be 2 feet below the mean high water level. If you make the subway 12 feet in depth, which I think is what is being discussed on the present plans, you would have a level of 242·5 above datum, which would be 2½ feet below the mean high water mark of the city and 3½ feet below highest water record given by the C. P. R., and 3 feet below the mean water level given in White's altitudes, which I think probably would be fair to take. This is referred to in the profile of the C. P. R. and C. N. R. over the Moira river, signed by J. W. Evans and marked by me "A" in red on File 3878·569."

Reference may be made to the plan attached hereto, which is referred to in Mr. Mountain's memorandum.

As has been indicated, the board, in its former judgment, had before it the question of a lift in the level of the bridge. Inferentially the board decided that it was not justified in directing this lift on the bridge, because, while there is no specific statement to this effect in the judgment, it is to be noted that what was dealt with was a possible subway to be obtained by flattening the floor of the bridge. By thus flattening the floor of the bridge and using cross-girder construction it was hoped there would be given sufficient additional head room to permit an 11-foot subway to be obtained. What was inferentially refused by the judgment as to the changed level of the bridge, was specifically refused by the final clause of Order No. 20609, which stated that the rest of the application on behalf of the city was to be refused. The elevation of the bridge not having been granted, it fell, therefore, within this final clause. It is true that what is now before us is for a 3-foot lift in the level of the bridge, but no new and material facts bearing on this question of change of level of the bridge having been brought before the board, no reason, on what is now before us, for the change in the former decision of the board appears. What is to be considered by the board on what is now before it is the question of levels with regard to a subway to be obtained by flattening the bridge floor, and in respect of the errors alleged to have existed in the former computations before the board.

As indicated in Mr. Mountain's memorandum, a subway 12 feet in depth, the clearance being obtained by flattening the bridge floor, would be 2½ feet below the mean high water level, as shown on the said plan; that is to say, during the time the summer level existed, the bottom of the subway would be 2½ feet below the level of the water. If, on the other hand, a subway of 11 feet were constructed, the bottom of the subway would be 1½ feet below the summer level of the water.

Counsel for the city said, at page 4545, that at the point in question 18 inches of water in ten years was the most there had ever been. This, it should be noted, is figured over the bottom elevation of a subway of 12 feet, 3 feet of this height being obtained by corresponding elevation of the bridge. But, with the subway obtained by flattening the bridge floor, there are only 9 feet available between the bridge floor, after it is thus flattened, and the surface of the ground underneath. That is to say, it is necessary to excavate 3 feet to get a depth of 12.

It was stated by counsel for the city that it was only under abnormal conditions that the subway would be flooded. It was also stated by him that they had records showing the level of the water from day to day. These records were not submitted to the board. What is before it is the detail set out on the plan prepared by Mr. Evans, a copy of which is attached hereto, and on what is thus presented there is, in respect of high water mark, a difference of ·03 of one foot, or $^{36}/_{100}$ of an inch, between the former and the present computations—a difference so slight as to be negligible. I cannot find, therefore, that there was any material error in the computations on which

the board's finding in the former judgment was made, and there is, therefore, no justification on what is before us for varying the former judgment in this respect.

What has already been said in regard to the change in level of the bridge is equivalent to stating that the application as to subway at James street fails also, because what is proposed there is subject to what has already been said in regard to the bridge levels and water levels. In the judgment of the Chief Commissioner the application for a subway at James street is refused, it being stated the traffic did not warrant it. There is no new and material evidence before the board to differentiate James street at present from James street at the time of the former hearing.

SPECIFIC RESERVATION OF THE RIGHT TO REHEARING.

Reference was made to the judgment of the Chief Commissioner, which was stated to contain a specific reservation of the right to rehearing. The board has never stood on technical grounds in regard to rehearings, and its process in connection with granting such rehearings is simple. The inference from the statement of counsel for the city as to the reservation spoken of is that the board felt this was a purely temporary disposition of the matter, and that the applicants had by such reservation rights greater than those which would normally be possessed by individuals to whom, under ordinary process, it was open to apply for a rehearing.

Counsel for the city was in error in regard to his understanding, for I find no such words of reservation in the judgment. Consequently, under this heading, the city is in on better or worse position than any individual who may desire to obtain a rehearing.

What has been set out at length shows that there are certain features of difference between what was before the board in the former instance and what is now before it. There are certain new points involving additional expense on the part of the city. The earnest belief of the city that the plan now proposed is in the general interest, is indicated by the burden of expense they are willing to assume. But these new portions of the application while changing in some regards some of the details, do not change the central points common to the two applications. These central points are the elevation of the bridge and the construction of the subways. The present application is not an original hearing in which it is possible to go into the matter independently of the special conditions which have come into existence, these special conditions being summarized in the judgment of the Chief Commissioner. What is now before the board is an application for reconsideration of its former decision; and, with a due appreciation of the importance of the matter and of the energy and public spiritedness shown by the city, I am unable to see that what is now before the board in reality goes to the propriety of the former order, or justifies a change being made.

As to the application of the C.L.O & W. R. Co. to take additional lands for the purposes of its yards at Belleville, no opposition is shown in the answer of the city, under seal, which is to be found on File No. 3701·377. The same position was expressed at the hearing by counsel for the city. The only material point of difference is as to the grade level crossing near King and Water streets which the railway company proposes.

The matter of the bridge level and the considerations dependent thereon having been dealt with, the application of the railway company now stands for determination.

The city does not contend that the additional facilities the railway company is desirous of obtaining, are unnecessary.

Order has already gone as to certain of the lands the railway company desires to take.

Order should go as to the certain portion of Lot No. 10, southeast of Willard street, referred to in the application of that company. Order should also go as to the portion east of King street, as indicated by the application of the company.

The application of the railway company to close Dundas street, between Norfolk and King streets, and divert it to Brock street by way of Norfolk and Willard streets, the latter to be opened as indicated in red on the plan filed, is not objected to by the city, which, however, states that it is of opinion that Willard street should be widened from its present width to 66 feet.

Dundas street and Norfolk are 66 feet in width, while Willard street is only about 38 feet in width, as shown on the plan of the C.L.O. & W.R. Co., on file No. 3701·377. It is proper that the substituted highway should have the same width as the highways whose place it takes, and this should be a condition of the order.

The railway company applies to close Mary and James streets, between the northern limit of Dundas street and the southern limit of the right of way of the C.N.O.R.; and to divert the traffic by means of a grade level crossing in the vicinity of the intersection of King and Water streets, as indicated approximately upon the plan attached to the application.

The city objects to the granting of a grade level highway crossing, and desires that a subway be constructed at or about this point.

In view of what has been said, an order for a level crossing will have to go. There is not before the board, at present, such information as warrants a conclusion as to the method of protection, if any, necessary at this point. This will, therefore, have to be reserved.

The situation as to Bay Bridge road is brought up by the proposed street diversion from this road, from a point south of the tracks. Bay Bridge road is crossed both by the tracks of the C.N.O.R. Co. and the C.L.O. & W.R. Co.

Some question is raised by Mr. Porter, counsel for the city as to the crossing of Bay Bridge road by the C.L.O. & W.R. Co's tracks in connection with its entrance into the proposed yards. The question of the propriety of these tracks being so constructed is apparently attacked on the ground that the Bay Bridge road is the property of a private company, which did not receive notice. Mr. Porter stated that if the diversion proposed, south of the tracks, were constructed to link up with the proposed subway at or near James street, the company would not ask for compensation therefor or raise any question as to notice.

As to Bay Bridge road, it is undoubtedly the main artery of travel between surrounding farming country and the city of Belleville. At the same time, there is not before the board such information regarding probable train and switching movements over this crossing and highway traffic thereon as would warrant a conclusion as to the method of protection, if any, necessary at this point. This will, therefore, have to be reserved.

Order to authorize construction under section 222 should also go.

Assistant Chief Commissioner Scott and Commissioner Goodeve concurred.

Order in accordance with judgment issued.

INTERCHANGE TRACKS BETWEEN C.P.R. AND G.T.R. AT COLDWATER, ONTARIO.

Jndgment, Assistant Chief Commissioner SCOTT, November 11, 1914:

The village of Coldwater has applied for an order directing the construction of interchange tracks between the C.P.R. and the G.T.R. at Coldwater.

The tracks of the two railways cross each other at grade in the village, and interchange tracks could be constructed at comparatively small cost.

In Coldwater the International Brick Company, and G. Boland's Planing Mill have both got Grand Trunk railway sidings and it would be some benefit to these concerns to be able to ship to Canadian Pacific Railway points.

Also, as is pointed out by our Traffic Officer Mr. Brown, in his report dated June 1, 1914, interchange at Coldwater would be of considerable benefit to stations west of Coldwater on the Grand Trunk: viz., Waubaushene, Midland, and Victoria Harbour. But, the industry that is chiefly concerned in this application is, the Fesserton Lumber

Company, of Fesserton, Ontario. Were it not for the existence of that concern, I would not feel justified in suggesting that the interchange be ordered.

The Fesserton Lumber Company's mills are situated within two miles of the crossing and are served by a spur from the Grand Trunk Railway Company. Because of certain physical conditions a spur to the mills from the C.P.R. could not conveniently be built. Among other difficulties, a crossing on the level over the Grand Trunk Railway Company's track would be necessary if a spur from the C.P.R. to the Fesserton Mills was constructed. In addition to the saw-mill and a stave plant in the saw-mill which the Fesserton Company have been operating for sometime, the Company has this year constructed a new cooperage factory. The Company's limits are on the C.P.R. and its mill on the G.T.R. The logs for the saw-mill have been brought in by water in the past; but as the source of supply is becoming further and further away from the mill, all logs will soon have to be brought in by rail. The hardwood timber used for cooperage being heavy cannot be floated, and it is now brought in by the C.P.R. and teamed to the factory. It is suggested that this material could be brought in by water in barges; but that, of course, would only be during the period of navigation. The Fesserton Lumber Company stated that if the interchange tracks were put in it could keep its mill running for several more months in the year than it now does, and that its cooperage factory would run all year. It says its new cooperage factory would need 1,000 cars a year of raw material which would be manufactured and shipped out again.

The figures submitted by the Grand Trunk Railway Company for the year 1913, show the timber company's business with that railway for that year to be as follows:—

Carloads of logs in	76
Carloads of lumber and cooperage stock out	414
	490

The timber company say that 1913 was a bad year; that their 1914 G.T.R. shipments will be larger. It suggests that 600 cars per annum would be a fairer estimate for an average year.

I am satisfied that the company's present business, with its expected immediate increase in business due to the construction of its new factory and its adoption of the method of bringing in sawlogs by rail, justifies this board in ordering the interchange applied for.

It seems to me the Fesserton Lumber Company should contribute something towards the cost of the construction of the interchange tracks; but it is difficult to apportion the cost among those concerned until we see what effect the interchange will have on the volume of business the Grand Trunk have been getting from the Fesserton Lumber Company. I propose that the apportionment of the cost be reserved for a year, and that complete returns be put in by the timber company and the two railway companies, of the business interchanged during that time. We would then be in a better position to make a fair apportionment of the cost than we are to-day. In the meantime the interchange should be put in by the Canadian Pacific Railway Company, within thirty days from the date of the order. The company should keep an accurate and detailed account of the expense of putting in the interchange. Plans should be submitted without delay, of the proposed tracks, for the approval of the board's engineer.

Judgment, Mr. Commissioner McLean, November 12, 1914:

I agree, subject to the condition that the applicant supply a bond to cover one-half of the cost of the work. This sum or so much thereof as the board may later, and after investigation deem proper, to be paid over and according to the direction of the board.

Assistant Chief Commissioner SCOTT: I am satisfied that this condition be put in the order.

Order in accordance with judgments issued.

APPLICATION OF THE CITY OF TORONTO WITH REFERENCE TO MAINTENANCE OF SUPERSTRUCTURE OF SUBWAY CARRYING KEELE STREET UNDER THE CANADIAN PACIFIC RAILWAY COMPANY'S TRACKS.

Judgment, Chief Commissioner DRAYTON, November 12, 1914:

This application was heard at a sitting of the board held in Toronto on July 3, 1914, at which there were present the assistant chief commissioner and Mr. Commissioner McLean.

My brother commissioners have asked me to consider the case, the whole question turning on the existing agreement between the parties of date November 18, 1889, made between the town of West Toronto Junction and the Canadian Pacific Railway Company.

This agreement is confirmed by chapter 110 of the Ontario Statutes of 1890.

The agreement shows that negotiations had been in progress for some time between the corporation and the railway company as to the location of the company's principal repair shops for the Ontario division of the railway at Toronto Junction; and that the company had agreed to locate and maintain such shops subject to the terms, conditions, and mutual covenants and agreements set forth.

Under clause 11 of the agreement, the corporation binds itself to construct on Keele street the subway in question.

The agreement describes the subway as a subway with retaining walls on either side of the subway along the whole distance of the company's property, with proper and sufficient approaches thereto; and the corporation is also bound to make all necessary roads, sidewalks, drains, and other things pertaining thereto; and will thereupon cause Keele street to be legally and effectually closed and discontinued as a highway and so as to prevent all traffic on the level along the said street across the company's right of way of 99 feet; the subway to be excavated across the company's right of way at Keele street for a distance of 99 feet and to such a depth as to permit of the approaches for the company's track being erected and maintained on any portion of the said retaining walls of the subway across the right of way, and at any place or places on the whole of the distance.

The corporation further agreed to provide and erect entirely at its own expense on the retaining walls iron or steel deck girders with floor system complete for five tracks; or, at the company's option, an iron or steel webb girder bridge with four floor system complete, sufficiently wide to accommodate five tracks the usual distance apart.

The city's application is based on the allegation that the condition of the superstructure is such that water comes down through it on the roadway and sidewalk, or through the bridge and down the sides of the abutment keeping them constantly wet and overflowing on the sidewalk beneath.

The city asks that this condition should be changed, and refers to section 15 of the agreement.

Under this section the corporation is obliged to maintain the retaining walls and bridge structures, and all roads, sidewalks, drains, and other things pertaining to the highway; while the company is bound to maintain the bridges provided for the tracks.

Under this clause, Mr. Geary's contention is a follows:—

> "They were to maintain the bridges, that is, of course, including the flooring of the bridges, the girders, and that sort of thing. We say that properly speaking it is a question of maintaining that, not only in some sort of repair that will stand up, but maintaining it in the way that, under the conditions of its existence, it should be maintained. They might maintain the flooring with spaces of three or four inches and let the rain in and ruin the street."

At the time the subway was built and the bridge structure provided by the municipality, the modern method of waterproofing, I am advised by the board's chief engineer, was unknown. The structure as completed was a sufficient and proper structure. The structure, moreover, which was to be maintained by the company was the structure as built by the corporation.

The present condition of affairs is not a new one. It is a condition which inevitably must arise with construction of the class which the corporation has installed.

Mr. Mountain has carefully inspected the structure, and reports that the leaks are not serious, although objectionable, and that the difficulty can be easily and economically overcome.

Although the bridge now forms part of the company's system and is its property, I am of the opinion that the municipality should be now given the right to make the superstructure waterproof, and that after the superstructure has been waterproofed at the expense of the municipality, the obligation should be thrown on the company for maintaining it waterproof in the future.

The municipality, if it desires to go on with the work, which is entirely in case of its street conditions, will furnish plans, showing the manner in which it desires to waterproof the structure, to the board's chief engineer for approval.

Assistant Chief Commissioner Scott and Commissioner McLean concurred.

Ordered accordingly.

APPLICATION OF THE CANADIAN PACIFIC RAILWAY COMPANY, UNDER SECTION 151, FOR AUTHORITY TO LOWER THE GRADE OF THE PORTION OF MAPLE STREET, WINNIPEG, MAN., LYING NORTHWARD OF THE PRODUCTION WESTERLY OF SAID MAPLE STREET OF A LINE DRAWN PARALLEL TO AND 26 FEET NORTH OF THE NORTHERLY LIMIT OF LOT 57, PLAN 63, SUBDIVISION OF LOT 35, EAST ST. JOHN, AND SOUTH OF POINT DOUGLAS AVENUE, NOT AT PRESENT COVERED BY THE TRACKS AND BUILDINGS OF THE SAID CANADIAN PACIFIC RAILWAY COMPANY.

Oral judgment delivered by Assistant Chief Commissioner SCOTT at the close of the hearing, November 16, 1914:

The railway company applies to have the grade of Maple street lowered. Maple street south of the Canadian Pacific property ends at the point which was the southern boundary of the southern half of Point Douglas avenue, which is now the property of the railway company, so that Maple street runs to an end abutting on the Canadian Pacific Railway Company's property. To facilitate the use of its station as it will be when it is changed, the railway company desires to lower the grade on the north end of that portion of Maple street. The only land not owned by the railway company belongs to the Dominion Government, and we have the consent of the Dominion Government to the application of the railway company.

The city does not oppose the application on its merits. The city points out that this would be an excellent opportunity for providing another way from south to north or north to south parallel to Main street underneath the tracks of the railway company. Between Main street and the river there are two subways, one on Rachel and the other at Higgins; but in addition to that they want another one. There may be considerable merit in what the city says, but it is no answer to the application of the railway company. The point before us to-day is whether or not the portion of Maple street in question shall be lowered.

It would be very much in the interests of the public to have that lowered so that the access to the baggage room of the new station will be convenient, and we feel that the application should be granted.

It may be that the city and railway company can get together at some future time for the carrying through of Maple street or some other street there; but whether or not there is to be some other opening underneath the railway company's property does not affect the present application.

An order will go accordingly.

SESSIONAL PAPER No. 20c

APPLICATION OF THE CANADIAN PACIFIC RAILWAY COMPANY, UNDER SECTIONS 222 AND 237, FOR AUTHORITY TO CONSTRUCT AN ALTERATION TO EXISTING SPUR FOR THE CITY OF WINNIPEG ON RACHEL STREET EAST, IN LOT 49, BLOCK B, CITY OF WINNIPEG, MAN., ON THE APPLICANT COMPANY'S MAIN LINE, MANITOBA DIVISION.

Oral judgment delivered by Assistant Chief Commisioner SCOTT at the close of the hearing, November 16, 1914:

When the spur was originally authorized, the somewhat stringent conditions the city of Winnipeg now insists we should insert in all Winnipeg branch line orders, and which we do not put in orders in any other part of Canada, were not drafted and were not put in the order. The spur was subsequently changed by only a few feet and a new order became necessary, and our office, following our practice, put in the city of Winnipeg clauses. The Canadian Pacific pointed out that it was a Winnipeg municipality spur and was merely being changed from one location to the other, and that these new clauses should not apply under the present circumstances.

We think their application should be granted, and clauses 1, 2, and 3 of that order will be struck out.

Mr. HUNT: Would you vary the contract for the elimination of that clause?

The ASSISTANT CHIEF COMMISSIONER: No, we have nothing to do with the contract.

Mr. HUNT: Because we were forced to sign it before we could get the change.

The ASSISTANT CHIEF COMMISSIONER: I know. We do not justify the railway's position in holding up parties.

Mr. HUNT: Because the old one was not under the same terms.

BRAMPTON MILLING COMPANY'S SWITCHING COMPLAINT.

Judgment, Chief Commissioner DRAYTON, November 16, 1914:

In this case the Assistant Chief Commissioner states in his memorandum:

> "It seems to me that the Canadian Pacific Railway Company is taking a very narrow view of this matter, and I would like to issue an order permitting the Grand Trunk to place cars at the Milling Company's property, notwithstanding the interswitching order."

Mr. Commissioner McLean's memorandum, while agreeing that the Canadian Pacific Railway Company is taking a technical position in the matter, states that it is within its rights, and that the provisions of the Interswitching Order apply no matter how short the movement is on the Canadian Pacific Railway's tracks.

Under the general interswitching order the carrier that has the right or obligation to perform the interswitching service is entitled to interswitching toll applicable to any distance within four miles. This rate rightly or wrongly has not been graduated according to distance by the board. It would indeed seem almost impossible to do this owing to the difficulty of estimating distance necessarily covered in the shunting operation over the complex tracks of an ordinary terminal.

This difficulty is apparent at the threshold of the inquiry, switching conditions changing as they do from time to time owing to the conditions of the yard and the congestion of business, with the result that what, in view of unoccupied tracks, might be a very simple switching operation, becomes complex and expensive when these tracks are already ordinarily occupied.

In this case the Canadian Pacific performs the switching service. The length of the haul is very short; but there is, however, a switching service, and there can be no doubt whatever but that the general interswitching order applied.

Unless the board is prepared to make an exact graduate schedule under which short movements on the one hand will receive the benefit, and longer movements on the other

hand be penalized, I can think of no principle which would justify the board in ordering that this service should be performed without charge on the one hand, or that the property of the Canadian Pacific can be used without any remuneration on the other.

It would be just as reasonable to say that in cases where the distance was a fraction over four miles that it was a hardship on industries so situate that they could not get interswitching performed for them under the terms of the general order.

A general order such as the present order is, has to start arbitrarily somewhere and stop arbitrarily somewhere. It is impossible to have any general regulations of this kind at an arbitrarily flat rate without such conditions. I do not desire to be understood as approving one way or the other of the principle, or as to the fairness of the charge either to the industries or to the carriers, who have objected very strongly to the charge on the ground that it does not nearly cover the cost of the service; but so long as the general order continues in force, so long must its provisions be given effect to.

APPLICATION OF MESSRS. GILLIES BROS., LTD., OF BRAESIDE, ONTARIO, AND GEORGE E. BAKER, ARNPRIOR, ONTARIO, FOR THE CONSTRUCTION OF INTERCHANGE TRACKS FOR THE PURPOSE OF INTERCHANGING CARS BETWEEN THE C.P.R. AND G.T.R. AT ARNPRIOR, ONTARIO.

Judgment, Commissioner McLEAN, November 25, 1914:

Gillies Bros. are not located at Arnprior but at Braeside, a station on the Canadian Pacific Railway's main line 3·2 miles west of Arnprior. Mr. Baker who supported the application of Gillies Bros. is engaged in the manufacture of brick and tile. He estimates that if an interchange track is put in and interswitching provided for that he will have about fifty cars per annum for Grand Trunk points. His plant is located about one mile from the Grand Trunk line. At present there is a haul of about a mile and a quarter from the plant to the Grand Trunk and Mr. Baker states that it would be very convenient to him to be able to load both Grand Trunk cars and Canadian Pacific Railway cars at the one siding. The application of Gillies Bros. is pressed owing to the fact that, on account of their present arrangement in regard to transportation, they are at a disadvantage in shipping to points on the Grand Trunk as compared with shippers on that railway who have a one line haul to the same points. The only firm in Arnprior having a private siding is the McLachlin Bros. Lumber Company. This company has already connection with both railways.

Under section 285 of the Railway Act the board may, where a branch line of one railway joins or connects the line or lines of such railway with another, entertain an application for interchange facilities over said track where the application is made by a railway company, a municipal corporation or other public body. The application now before the board falls within the scope of section 228 which deals *inter alia* with a situation "where the line or tracks of one railway are intersected or crossed by those of another." Under this section the board may order that the tracks shall be connected. The tracks of the Canadian Pacific and of the Grand Trunk intersect at Arnprior. Under this section the board has a wider discretion as to parties applicant for, in addition to the provisions as to application set out in section 285, provision is made in section 228 for an application being entertained from "any person or persons interested."

The question is raised as to whether there is such a public interest as will justify an interchange track being installed. In general the applications which have come before the board have been concerned with cases in which such a number of industries or applicants were involved as to show that there was a substantial public interest. In the present application there is in reality only one industry concerned for, the application of Baker is not very seriously pressed. But whether the application is made by one or by many it is the question of public interest which must justify the intervention of the board. That is to say before it grants the relief the board must be satisfied that there is a substantial public interest to be served thereby.

The town of Arnprior does not ask for the installation but by resolution, on file, it states that it is agreeable to the installation of the interchange track provided that the law as to blocking of crossings is complied with; and that the railway companies interested keep all highway crossings of the interchange track in a proper state of repair.

The Grand Trunk supports the application and states its willingness to bear half of the cost of construction and maintenance.

Were the application one which arose under section 285 a valid objection that there was a lack of public interest might be taken on the ground that the present applicant did not fall within the categories of parties applicant set out in the section. But as has been indicated section 228 is so worded as to permit an application to be made by an individual.

Objection is taken by the Canadian Pacific to the granting of the order asked for. It is stated that Gillies Brothers are in no different position from any shipper located at a local point on the railway; and that they obtain no different treatment. Objection is also taken to opening up the connection asked for on the ground that it would deflect from the Canadian Pacific to the Grand Trunk traffic which would otherwise move exclusively on the Canadian Pacific. This objection might of course be taken in any case where an order for an interchange is made; for under such condition there will always be some dislocation of traffic.

The applicants ship about 2,000 cars of lumber per annum; fifty per cent of this output being for domestic consumption.

The application is apparently the first of its kind to come before the board, for, while the applicants are within the limits as to distance laid down by the interswitching order, they are not located at Arnprior where the interchange is asked for.

The application falls squarely within section 228. Since under that section the board may entertain an application from an individual the only question concerned is whether it is justifiable to grant the application. It is apparent there will be a movement, important in amount which will reach a wider market if the interchange is granted. Without the facility afforded by the interchange this movement will be hampered. The objection of the Canadian Pacific regarding the deflection of traffic has already been referred to. It does not appear probable that there will be any appreciable reciprocal traffic advantage to it for some time at least from obtaining a Grand Trunk connection at this point. In the London case Grand Trunk Railway Company *v.* Canadian Pacific Railway Company and city of London 6 C.R.C. 331, it was said:—

> "The provisions of the Railway Act which require railway companies thus to interchange traffic at connecting points are introduced, not for the purpose of benefiting one railway company at the expense of another, but solely in the interest of the public."

Section 228 authorized the board to " . . . . determine by what company or companies, or other corporations or persons, and in what proportions, the cost of making and maintaining any such connection shall be borne . . . ."

The board has, where a considerable number of industries have been interested in the application, divided the cost between the railways. In the present case, while the interchange will be, as already indicated, in the public interest, Gillies Brothers have a predominating special interest in obtaining the facility. They should, therefore, contribute to the cost.

The cost of construction should be borne in equal portions by the Grand Trunk and the applicants, Gillies Brothers. Agreement should be arrived at between the parties whether payment is to be made in cash by applicants on estimate of cost, or on completion of work and account rendered; or whether payment is to be secured by the putting up of a bond. Order is not to issue until the board is informed of the arrangement in this respect arrived at.

Cost of maintenance and cost of such protection, if any, as may be ordered by the board in respect of any portion of the interchange track should be borne by the Grand Trunk. If the Canadian Pacific and the Grand Trunk do not agree within fifteen days to accept the plan submitted by the applicants, the Grand Trunk shall thereafter submit a plan to the Canadian Pacific, and any points of disagreement existing between the parties, if an agreement is not arrived at within fifteen days from the submission of such plan by the Grand Trunk, shall be settled by an engineer of the board. The plan in either event is to be approved by the board. The necessary materials and the work of construction to be supplied and done by the Grand Trunk.

Concurred in by Chief Commissioner Drayton, Assistant Chief Commissioner Scott and Commissioner Goodeve.

COMPLAINT OF C. W. OZIAS, *et al.*, *re* PROPOSED CLOSING OF CANADIAN PACIFIC RAILWAY STATION AT MAZEPPA, ALBERTA.

Oral judgment delivered by Assistant Chief Commissioner SCOTT at the close of the hearing, November 26, 1914:

In this case the board is of the opinion that the agent should be maintained. We have fixed an arbitrary amount of $15,000 as the revenue which a railway company should derive at a station to warrant us in ordering the maintenance of an agent. Of course, that is an arbitrary figure. Nevertheless we must have some figure, and after a good deal of thought that was the figure determined by the board.

From the statement put in by the railway company of its earnings for the twelve months ending the 30th of October last, their total revenue at this station was $20,146.71, not counting express. The express is a small amount, about $35 a month. If we take the last two months, September and October, the average is more than $15,000. Even if we take October alone, adding in $35 for express, it brings it up, to $15,000 per annum.

On these facts the request of the company to be permitted to remove the agent is refused.

Of course, it is open to the company at any future date to make a further application if the conditions warrant it.

APPLICATION OF THE TOWN OF COURTENAY, B.C., FOR AN ORDER DIRECTING THE ESQUIMALT AND NANAIMO RAILWAY COMPANY TO PERMIT THE PROVINCIAL GOVERNMENT TO MAKE A ROAD FROM THE COMPANY'S FREIGHT SHED IN A NORTH-WESTERLY DIRECTION TO THE LAKE TRAIL, A DISTANCE APPROXIMATELY OF 900 FEET SO AS TO OBVIATE THE HAUL NOT NECESSARY FROM THE LAKE TRAIL ROAD TO THE FREIGHT SHED OF APPROXIMATELY 5,700 FEET.

Oral judgment delivered by Assistant Chief Commissioner SCOTT at the close of the hearing, December 2, 1914.

The applicant is asking that they be given the temporary right to construct a highway from the railway company's freight sheds northerly to connect with Union street. The railway company has a road from its freight sheds southerly connecting with Cumberland road.

It is quite apparent that the applicants desire, not facilities to get to or from the railway company's sheds from the north, so much as a highway to be used for highway purposes, quite irrespective of railway purposes, connecting Union street with Cumberland. In other words, they want the railway company to supply the right of way for a municipal highway. They say it is only to be used temporarily. The railway company says that once a highway is established there, and money spent on it, in all probability they will be saddled with a highway through their property for all time.

I think the railway company is right. If the highway got established there the chances are it would remain a highway, and the railway would have a great deal of difficulty in getting rid of it.

This is not a case where the compulsory powers of the board should be invoked. If the municipality or the government desires this privilege from the railway company, it is a matter which the railway company might give by agreement in some amicable arrangement, but it is not a matter which we would order. The application is dismissed.

APPLICATION OF THE HAMILTON STREET RAILWAY COMPANY FOR PERMISSION TO CROSS THE TRACKS OF THE GRAND TRUNK RAILWAY COMPANY'S MAIN LINE ON KENILWORTH AVENUE, TOWNSHIP OF BARTON.

Judgment, Chief Commissioner DRAYTON, December 2, 1914:

The application was heard at a sitting of the board held in Hamilton on April 23, 1914.

The street railway company, in its application, filed by-law No. 883 of the township of Barton, which recites, among other things, that the street railway company applied to the township for leave to extend its railway over certain highways, and grants permission and authority for its construction along the road allowanee between lots 2 and 3, in the first and seeond eoneessions of the township, otherwise known as Kenilworth avenue, from the northerly limit of the base line between the Broken Front and the first concession of the township, to the northerly limit of the second concession in the township, otherwise known as Barton street.

The main line of the Grand Trunk Railway crosses Kenilworth avenue within these limits.

The application is also supported, and indeed required, by by-law No. 1430 of the city of Hamilton, which approved the agreement entered into between the applicant company and the city of Hamilton, of date Mareh 10, 1913.

The agreement approved recites that, in the opinion of the council of the corporation of the city of Hamilton, it is desirable that street railway service be provided on the streets in the agreement mentioned; that negotiations had taken place between the city and the applicant company with a view to obtaining these extensions; and that the applicant company had agreed to construct the street railway line referred to, if the necessary consent could be obtained from the township of Barton and from the county of Wentworth.

It may be noted that no interest of the county in the street question has been disclosed, and that the applicant company has proceeded without such consent, which would appear to be unnecessary.

The agreement, besides providing for construction and maintenance, contains the following provisions:

> "10. The city corporation shall assist the street railway company in an application to be made to the Board of Railway Commissioners for Canada for a subway beneath the main line tracks of the Grand Trunk Railway Company at Kenilworth avenue, for vehicular, street railway, and pedestrian traffic: and the Board of Railway Commissioners for Canada shall be asked to apportion the cost of this work between all parties interested."

The Grand Trunk Railway Company contended that no portion whatever of the cost should be placed upon that company, that the cost not only of construction but of maintenance for all time should be placed upon the applicant company.

The answer to the application filed by the city of Hamilton points out, among other things, that Kenilworth avenue lies within the township of Barton; that Barton township has a large population; and that the street railway in question is mainly for the accommodation of residents of that portion of the township lying east of

Hamilton. It also points out that, owing to the increased traffic on the main line of the Grand Trunk, the highway crossing in question has been rendered very dangerous to the public; and that, should a subway be ordered by the board, the Grand Trunk should be ordered to pay a large portion of the cost, as should the township of Barton.

At the hearing, all parties interested were represented. The right that the Grand Trunk Railway Company had on Kenilworth avenue was to cross it with two lines; but by an order of the board made on the consent of the city of Hamilton in the year 1907, the railway company was authorized to lay two additional tracks over the crossing in question, one of the tracks extending from a point west of Victoria avenue in Hamilton to what is described as Gage's spur at or near the eastern limits of the city; the other track extending from an unnamed street situate about midway between Wentworth street and Sherman avenue to Gage's spur, which spur is shown on the plan to lie some 900 feet to the east of Kenilworth avenue.

Paragraph 2 of the order is as follows:—

> "Should any further protection be at any time hereafter ordered at any of the streets crossed by such additional tracks (with the exception of Victoria avenue, as to which there is an order of the Railway Committee of the Privy Council, dated July 8, 1891), the Grand Trunk is to install gates, including necessary house or tower, and maintain the same; to hire necessary watchman to operate the same; and the city shall pay to the Grand Trunk monthly one-half the cost of such watchman's wages."

The order as issued was settled and signed by the respective solicitors for the city and the railway company.

The interest of the township of Barton in the road seems to have been entirely overlooked. Probably the enlarged railway facilities were necessary because of the constantly increasing traffic in Hamilton, and were required by the city in the interest of its merchants; and that, in consideration of the larger question, the exact boundary of Hamilton was lost sight of. That boundary has been growing to the east; it now extends to Kenilworth avenue, on the north of the Grand Trunk main line tracks, where it recedes a distance of some 2,600 feet to Ottawa street, continuing southerly on Ottawa street until the grounds of the Hamilton Jockey Club are passed—a distance of some 1,250 feet, from which point it is again extended to Kenilworth avenue. Manifestly the only reason for the jog was the fact of its being thought that it would be a burden on the large and unimproved property of the Jocky Club, to throw it inside of the city limits and subject it to city taxation.

Whatever the legal boundaries may be, the land lying immediately to the east of Kenilworth avenue is urban in character, has been cut up into building lots, and is now used to a greater or less extent by those who are employed in the city.

Apart from the actual legal limits of the boundaries, there is but little difference in character, between that part of the township adjacent to Kenilworth avenue, in the neighbourhood in question, and the similar section of Hamilton itself. Doubtless it is for these reasons that the township's interests were entirely overlooked by the parties when the agreement embodied in the order of 1907 was arrived at.

There seems, however, to be no doubt, but that the part of the street where the subway is applied for is actually in the township; indeed Mr. Farmer, who appeared for the township, so admitted, although he contended that the whole question was one which concerned Hamilton and the extension of the Hamilton Street Railway System, rather than one which concerned the township.

The railway company has but three lines crossing Kenilworth avenue; and, having regard to its own and the present highway traffic it submitted that as yet there is no necessity whatever for a subway; that any necessity which may now arise is wholly due to the proposed street railway construction; and, hence, that the matter of cost is one entirely for the municipalities and the street railway company.

The company also relied on statistics for 24 hours ending at 7 a.m., March 7, showing that only 17 vehicles and 381 passengers on foot passed over the crossing. While this estimate as to that particular day is doubtless correct, highway traffic will undoubtedly increase with the improvement of the highway and the development of the district consequent on the extension of the street railway system.

The railway company also pointed out that, while in 1904 there were 39 trains a day, at the present time there are only 31 trains, the trainloads now being heavier than formerly.

I do not know at what speed trains were formerly operated over the crossing. To-day they are operated at a high rate of speed. Mr. McCallum, the city engineer, places it at 60 miles an hour. Possibly this estimate is a little high; but I have no doubt that, as a matter of fact, trains on this main line do run at a speed of 40 miles and upwards.

It is idle to contend that, under such circumstances, a double track street railway, with cars running as they will at comparatively short intervals, can be carried across the railway tracks on the level without serious jeopardy both to the rolling stock and to the public who use the crossing. By "the public" I mean not only that portion of the public who will travel in the street cars and on the highway, but also on the railway itself.

On the board rests the duty of determining the protection which should be provided at the crossing which is asked for; and it may specifically direct that one line or track, or one set of lines or tracks, be carried over or under the other.

I think there is no doubt but that the street railway and the city had agreed upon a proper and feasible solution of the question, and that the crossing should be effected by means of a subway.

As it developed at the hearing that the question of annexing to the city that part of the township which would be benefited by the new line was under consideration, and that petitions under the Municipal Act requiring such annexation had been filed, the question of the distribution of cost was not settled at the hearing, but was left over to enable the parties interested to determine whether or not the territory would be annexed; but the board was of the opinion that, in the meantime, the subway, as asked for by the Street Railway Company, might be constructed and that work thereon might proceed without delay.

Some questions have since arisen as to what the subway entails. The work should be constructed so as to allow—after whatever street pavement the municipality desires to adopt has been laid—a clear headroom of 14 feet between the highest point of the road surface and the lowest point of the overhead structure.

The subway plans call for approaches with a grade of 3 per cent. The usual practice calls for a grade not steeper than 5 per cent; so if the municipality desires to cut the grade of its streets to 3 per cent instead of 5 per cent, it may do so; but, following the decision in the Yonge Street Case, Toronto and other cases, the board consistently decides that the extra cost, over and above what a construction with a 5 per cent grade would have entailed, must be borne entirely by the municipality.

So far as the street railway is concerned, it does not desire a better grade than 5 per cent; and the railway company strongly objects to paying for a better grade than what is called for by the statute.

The right of way of the Grand Trunk is 100 feet wide. The plans which were prepared by the city, showing the proposed subway, do not extend it across this 100 feet; they show merely sufficient accommodation on the deck of the subway, that portion in which the railway company is interested, to accommodate four tracks.

Under the order already referred to, the right of the railway company to construct across the street is limited to four tracks. The city in its plans has gone as far as can be required of it; and, if the Grand Trunk finds that it is necessary to utilize the whole of its right of way, and requires, or thinks it will require in the near future, a subway with a deck of 100 feet, instead of that now proposed by the city—

while I think the railway company is entitled to have it—the extra cost must be borne by the railway company. This extra must cover not only the additional length of the retaining walls and deck surface, but also the expenditure for additional land or consequent damage, if any, which may be incident to the extension.

The proceedings for annexation have not been carried out; and the city has asked that the cost of the subway be apportioned among the companies and corporations liable.

The Lords of the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council have since issued their judgment on the appeal of the British Columbia Electric Railway Company, Limited, against the city of Vancouver and the Vancouver, Victoria and Eastern Railway and Navigation Company.

Opportunity was given the parties to file written arguments on the question of the board's jurisdiction to apportion costs, in view of this judgment.

Not only owing to the importance of the question to municipalities, and provincial and Dominion railways but also because of the existence of dangerous grade crossings, the abolition of which will be difficult, if indeed possible in case the whole cost should be placed upon Dominion companies as well as on account of the amount which may be involved in this case, I propose to deal somewhat fully with the issue raised.

For ease of reference, the arguments submitted by the parties are now set out. That of the township of Barton is as follows:—

"1. The application herein was made by the Hamilton Street Railway Company.

"2. Their formal application is dated January 23, 1914, and is as follows:—

"HAMILTON, January 23, 1914.

"THE BOARD OF RAILWAY COMMISSIONERS FOR CANADA, APPLICATION NO.....

"The Hamilton Street Railway Company hereby applies to the board for an order, under section 227 of the Railway Act, for permission to cross the tracks of the Grand Trunk Railway (main line), on Kenilworth avenue, in the township of Barton, county of Wentworth, as shown on plan and profile No. 525, and according to the provisions of section 10 of By-law No. 1430 of the city of Hamilton, and By-law No. 883 of the township of Barton, copies of which are submitted herewith, and for an order apportioning the cost of same between all parties interested.

"HAMILTON STREET RAILWAY COMPANY,

"EDW. P. COLEMAN,

"General Manager.

"A. D. CARTWRIGHT, Esq., Secretary,
"Board of Railway Commissioners for Canada,
"Ottawa, Ontario.

"3. The Street Railway Company's application was made pursuant to an agreement made between the Street Railway Company and the city of Hamilton on the 10th of March, 1913, in which the city of Hamilton agreed (paragraph 10), to assist the Street Railway Company in an application to be made to this board for a subway beneath the main line tracks of the Grand Trunk Railway on Kenilworth avenue. The application was therefore really made by the Hamilton Street Railway Company and the city of Hamilton. Both these corporations have therefore invoked and have submitted to the jurisdiction of this board.

"4. The keynote of the judgment of the Privy Council in the British Columbia Electric Railway Company case is expressed by Lord Moulton in these words—'It following, therefore, that the application was a matter between the corporation and the railway company alone, the tramway company was entitled to be present to see that its interests were not prejudiced by any order which

might affect injuriously property belonging to it. But the application was not made against it nor was it asking any privilege from the railway board so that its presence did not give to the railway board any jurisdiction to make this order against it.'

" The township of Barton has made no application nor is it asking for any privilege from the Railway Board. The street railway company did make the application. The property in the township of Barton in the vicinity of the proposed subway will be injuriously affected owing to change of grade by the construction of the subway and not benefited by it. Already one property owner at least, Traiton L. Moore, has made a claim before this board for compensation and is opposing the application.

" 5. The Hamilton Street Railway Company, in its further answer of July 29, 1914, insists that the order is not made under section 59 of the Railway Act. Its formal application was under section 227 of the Act. If the order is not made under section 59 of the Railway Act, then it follows under the Privy Council judgment that this board has no jurisdiction to compel the township of Barton to pay any portion of the cost of the subway.

" 6. If the board has no jurisdiction to compel the street railway company to pay a share of the cost under section 59, then it can have no jurisdiction to compel the township of Barton to pay any portion of the cost thereof. On the other hand, if the board has jurisdiction to compel the township of Barton to pay a share of the cost, then it also has jurisdiction to compel the Hamilton Street Railway Company to pay a share of such cost.

" 7. The application herein is made under section 227 of the Railway Act as appears by the street railway company's formal application above set out. It is therefore submitted that the railway companies alone can be compelled under this section to pay the cost of this subway and that the board's jurisdiction is confined to adjusting the proportion of the cost as between the Grand Trunk Railway Company and the Hamilton Street Railway Company. The Hamilton Street Railway Company is within the jurisdiction of the board because it has made the application and the Grand Trunk Railway is within the jurisdiction because it is a Dominion railway corporation.

" 8. It is therefore submitted on the proper construction of the judgment of the Privy Council in the British Columbia Electric Railway Company case that the board has no jurisdiction to compel the township of Barton to pay any portion of the costs of this subway; that the board has jurisdiction to compel the applicants, the Hamilton Street Railway Company and the Grand Trunk Railway, to pay the cost of the subway; and that that is the only jurisdiction which the board has in this matter, unless the city of Hamilton is also liable as being in fact a joint applicant under its agreement with the street railway company."

The argument made on behalf of the street railway company is as follows:—

" 1. The order in this case seems to be similar to the order made in the case of British Columbia Electric Railway and Vancouver, Victoria, and Eastern Railway, as it is asking the street railway company to contribute to the cost of construction of an underground crossing as part of a municipal highway.

" 2. If it is sufficient to relieve the Hamilton Street Railway from paying any portion of the cost of the said crossing to point out that the order is not made under section 59 of the Railway Act, it is submitted that the said order was not made under section 59, and that under section 227 no mention is made of the apportionment of cost.

" 3. If an order is made making the street railway pay any portion of the cost, it is submitted there can be no other justification but that when the crossing

is completed the street railway will have the right to use it as well as private citizens.

"In answer to that, the street railway would say, as was stated by Counsel before the board, that the company are ready and willing to drop the extension, and that further, the entire extension was planned and is being executed solely at the urgent request of the city, and that evidence proving this can be readily obtained if the board desires evidence along these lines, and that the application is really the city's application and made by the street railway in compliance with the terms of their by-law at the city's request.

"4. It is also submitted that the by-law permitting the street railway to operate in the city of Hamilon expires in 1928, and that it is doubtful whether the amount that the street railway would have to pay toward the underground crossing (if any), could be added to the value of the street railway in 1928, if the city then see fit to exercise its privilege of taking over the street railway.

"Section 15 of by-law 624 of the city of Hamilton:

"'The privileges granted by this by-law shall extend until the 22nd day of December, 1928, but at the expiration thereof, the corporation of the city of Hamilton may, after giving six months notice prior to the expiration of the said term of their intention to assume the ownership of the railway, and all real and personal property in connection with the working thereof, on payment of their value, to be determined by arbitration; and in case the said corporation should fail in exercising the right of assuming the ownership of the said railway at the date aforesaid, the privileges granted by this by-law shall continue, but the said corporation may, at the expiration of every five years to elapse after the said date, exercise the same right of assuming the ownership of the said railway and of all real and personal estate thereto appertaining, after one year's notice to be given preceding the expiration of every fifth year as aforesaid, and on payment of their value to be determined by arbitration; and any arbitaration under this clause shall be subject to the provisions of the Municipal Act and of the Acts respecting arbitrations and references, and the arbitrators shall have all the powers of arbitrators appointed under the said Acts, and each party shall pay half the costs of the arbitration; and in any such arbitration the valuation of the company's property shall be made upon the basis of the actual value thereof, without regard to the way in which it is being used and employed, or the net revenue received therefrom, and any contribution made by the city to the cost of the railway shall be taken into consideration.'

"5. It is submitted even if the board has jurisdiction to charge any portion of the cost to the street railway, that it is not fair that it should do so."

In answer to these arguments, the city of Hamilton relies on paragraphs 1, 2, and 10 of the agreement already referred to.

Paragraph 10 has already been set out in this judgment, while paragraphs 1 and 2 contain the agreement of the Street Railway Company to lay the line in question, the application of the company to construct the line being absolute not only to build the work but to build it within 16 months from the time fixed by the city engineer for the commencement of the work, with the exception that in calculating the period of 16 months, the months of December, January, February and March, and the first 15 days of April should not be counted, nor any time that might be lost during the operation by causes beyond the control of the Street Railway Company, such as hearings and proceedings of the Board of Railway Commissioners, delay in putting streets to be occupied in proper condition, strikes, and questions arising with the township of Barton or the county of Wentworth as to the right to use Kenilworth avenue.

The Grand Trunk Railway Company's submissions were that, as the Street Railway Company is here the applicant, the judgment in the British Columbia case, which proceeded entirely under the peculiar circumstances of that case, was not applicable.

The municipalities as well as railways subject to provincial jurisdiction have been directed to contribute to works of this character, not only by the board but also by the railway committee of the Privy Council, whose duties are now performed by the board. Jurisdiction was conferred on the Railway Committee of the Privy Council, subject to sanction of the Governor-in-Council, by the Act amending the Consolidated Railway Act of 1879, the amending statute being 47 Vic., chap. 11, sec. 3. Under this section, which included, among other powers, the right to order that streets be carried either over or under the railway by means of an arch or bridge, instead of crossing the same on the level, the jurisdiction of the railway committee was confined to works which appeared to it expedient or unnecessary for the public safety and the direct power was conferred by the Act to apportion the cost of the work between the railway company and any other corporation or person interested therein as should appear to the committee to be just and reasonable.

The provision is continued in substance, although somewhat changed in form, by "The Railway Act" R.S.C. 1886, sec. 74. It may be noted that the right to apportion cost now reads between the company, that is the railway company, and any person interested therein, (i.e. the work), as appears to the railway committee just and reasonable, the words "other corporation or" being dropped in the new section. These provisions are re-enacted in the Railway Act of 1888 as sections 187 and 188.

No change was made in the statute until the Railway Act of 1903 was passed, as a consequence of which the Railway Board takes the place of the railway committee of the Privy Council. The first material section of the Act is section 47, which reads as follows:

> "When the board, in the exercise of any power vested in it by this Act, or the Special Act, in and by any order directs any structure, appliances, equipment, works, renewals, or repairs to be provided, constructed, reconstructed, altered, installed, operated, used or maintained, it may order by what company, municipality, or person, interested or affected by such order, as the case may be, and when or within what time, and upon what terms and conditions as to the payment of compensation or otherwise, and under what supervision, the same shall be provided, constructed, reconstructed, altered, installed, operated, used or maintained; and the board may order by whom, in what proportion, and when, the cost and expenses of providing, constructing, reconstructing, altering, installing and executing such structures, equipment, works, renewals, or repairs, or the supervision (if any), or the continued operation, use or maintenance of the same, or of otherwise complying with such order, shall be paid."

And sections 186 and 187, deal specifically with the powers of the board, having regard to either existing or proposed crossings of highways by railways. Under these new sections, the board should deal with questions arising under them, having regard to the protection, safety and convenience of the public. Under the prior legislation public safety only was the controlling consideration. Owing to the fact that the immediate necessity for the elimination of the grade crossing in this case is the proposed construction of the tracks of the street railway company, a provincial company, reference is made to sections 7 and 177. The effect of these sections is to place the local company under the jurisdiction of the board in so far as its crossing over the tracks of a Dominion company is concerned, with the right to direct that the tracks of one company be carried over those of the other.

In the Railway Act of 1906, section 47 becomes section 59, and sections 186 and 187 become sections 237 and 238 respectively. Sections 7 and 177 as re-drafted become sections 8 and 227.

Sestions 237 and 238 were repealed by 8-9 Edward VII, chapter 32, sections 4 and 5, and new sections substituted therefor. These sections have not been since amended. The effect of the change is, in the first instance, to make it clear that the sections apply to projected as well as to existing highways or railways, the word "existing"

qualifying the words "highway" and "railway" being omitted and the word "any" inserted in its stead. The new section is extended in terms to the railway itself, so that railways may be carried over, along, or under highways and that railways may be diverted, and the direct right is given the board to consider not only the danger of obstruction arising from the particular crossing under consideration, but also in connection with any existing crossing. The change seems to be a change to render clear the jurisdiction of the board to order works such as the board ordered in the Toronto viaduct case (C.P. Ry. Co. v. Toronto, 1911, A.C. 461), where not only had the railway to be diverted, but the question as to danger at any one crossing had to be considered in connection with other existing crossings, and a solution applicable not to any one crossing but to a whole district had to be evolved.

The new section 238 makes these new provisions of the Act apply to crossings already constructed. Subsection 3 of the new section is not to be found in the previous Act. Its provisions are:—

> "3. Notwithstanding anything in this Act, or in any other Act, the board may, subject to the provisions of section 238A of this Act, order what portion, if any, of cost is to be borne respectively by the company, municipal or other corporation, or person in respect of any order made by the board under this or the preceding section, and such order shall be binding on and enforcible against any railway company, municipal or other corporation, or person named in such order."

This section is very similar to the provisions of the Act of 1884 (47 Vic., ch. 11, s. 3), empowering the Railway Committee of the Privy Council to apportion the cost, except that "other corporation or person" in the old section must be interested in the improvement before it or he can be called upon to contribute. As it occurs to me, no jurisdiction could, or indeed should, be taken over any municipality, corporation, or person not interested in or affected by the works ordered, the powers of the board under section 59 are not as a matter of fact enlarged.

The Dominion Parliament has, in my opinion, no jurisdiction over municipalities or provincial companies in cases where interest in the works ordered does not exist. There is no power in the Dominion enabling it to require municipalities or provincial companies generally to contribute to the cost of works contemplated, or to pass laws affecting provincial corporations of any kind as such. The authorities do not go further than decide that, the precautions adopted being necessary, there is nothing *ultra vires* in the ancillary power conferred by the section to make an equitable adjustment of the expenses among the corporations or companies interested.

I am of the opinion that the judgment of the Privy Council in the Vancouver case is not a judgment of general application, as has been contended. It does not decide that provincial railway companies or inferentially that municipalities may not be called upon to contribute to the cost of works ordered under sections 237 and 238 of the Act, although it would appear to be clear that, in so far as provincial railways are concerned, the appropriate sections are 8 and 227.

The judgment is not a finding that the legislation of the Dominion affecting municipal corporations and provincial railways, regarding the question of safety, convenience, and protection at crossings of highways by Dominion railways or *vice versa*, is *ultra vires* of its ancillary powers. The case is undoubtedly authority for the proposition, that the board has no jurisdiction to consent to the municipality making a highway improvement and ordering that a provincial line contribute to the cost thereof. I think it may be said to determine that no local railway company can be subjected to any part of the cost of works which the board does not find to be necessary to remove a danger created in whole or in part by the crossing of a provincial line by a Dominion line.

Here there is no ground for contention that the subway in question is built merely as a matter of highway improvement. At present, the highway is level or

practically so. The subway, while relieving highway traffic from the danger of a crossing, creates new grades, and to that extent constitutes an impediment to street traffic.

Construing the judgment in the British Columbia case as I do, it is necessary to consider the general principle applicable.

The rights-of-way of railway companies, whether Dominion or provincial, are in a sense public highways, and have often been so considered. They are both subject to the same public right. They are public conveniences differing in degree only and not in principle from toll roads, a direct payment having to be made by the public for the right to pass over any of them. In so far as the ordinary municipal highway is concerned, there is, of course, no toll, because the public contributes out of the general fund or through special assessments under the appropriate local improvement clauses to the construction and maintenance of the highway.

The mere existence of junctions or crossings of these respective highways constitute no danger in itself; the danger is that which results from conflict of traffic or use.

I find that the practice of the board in the past has been directed entirely to the consideration of the question in accordance with this principle: no orders for special protection have been made as the result of the mere existence of crossings; the concluding factor in each case has been the amount of traffic, its character, and the surrounding conditions which might make the use of the crossing unduly dangerous.

In the case of the Toronto Suburban crossing of the Grand Trunk (the Toronto Suburban being a local line), the principle was perhaps extended by the late Chief Commissioner who, on the local company establishing that, while the number of cars passing on its line had decreased, the traffic on the Dominion line had materially increased, changed the basis of contribution to the safety devices maintained, by revising the share of the cost of maintenance which the previous order had placed upon the local company.

The principle on which cost has been divided seems to be, at least in part, that the companies or municipalities contributing to the common danger which is obviated or minimized, should contribute in proportion, with the modification that, where conditions of traffic have not changed much since the original right of crossing accrued, priority of title at the point of crossing is taken into account. The practice that has obtained also, to some extent at least, probably rests on the fact that, with the admitted danger at many crossings in the country, where, in some instances the highway construction is prior to and in other cases subsequent to that of the railway it would be impossible to eliminate the danger, if the whole cost were placed upon the Dominion company; while, on the other hand, it is undoubtedly a great advantage to municipalities to obtain the elimination of dangerous crossings.

The question, however, is not what ought to be done, but is one of jurisdiction. The Dominion legislation has been sustained by the courts on more than one occasion when it has been invoked for the purpose of supporting or creating a liability on a municipal corporation. In *re* Canadian Pacific Railway Company and county and township of York (1898), 25 A. R. (Ontario) 65; Toronto vs. Grand Trunk Railway Company (1906), 37 S. C. R. 232; Canadian Pacific Railway Company vs. Toronto (1906), 7 C.R.C. 274, and (1908) Appeal Cases 54.

Although provincial railways have in turn been ordered by the Board to contribute to the cost of protection at crossings of their lines by Dominion railways, not only where their line has been built on a private right-of-way, but also on public highways, the jurisdiction of the board to make such orders does not seem to have been challenged until the question was brought up in the Vancouver case.

On the broad question of Dominion jurisdiction, there would seem to be no reason why the local municipality deriving no direct revenue or benefit from the traffic on its highway, should be subject to Dominion legislation compelling it to contribute to the cost of protecting that traffic from the danger incident to the operation of a Dominion

line, if at the same time such legislation is *ultra vires* as against the Provincial Railway Company whose revenues are in part derived from its traffic operations which, as a result of the same legislation, become protected.

That general question, however, need not be pursued to an ultimate end in this case. The local railway company is desirous of getting a crossing. If it were applying for a crossing on its own private right-of-way, its application would be granted only on condition that it constructed at its own cost a subway sufficient to carry its tracks under the Dominion Railway.

Note in *re* attorney general of the province of Alberta *v.* the attorney general of the Dominion of Canada, *et al.* (1914), 31 Times Law Reports, 32.

The mere fact that it desires its crossing along the line of the public highway cannot, in my view, detract from the right of the board to determine how the crossing shall be effected, or at whose expense. Indeed, the only question at all open is that of expense, as the local company itself considers the subway necessary and asks for it.

On the other hand, simply because a subway is necessary for the purposes of the local line, it would be manifestly unfair to saddle that company with the cost of a subway sufficient not only for its purposes but for highway traffic.

Perhaps it would not be out of place to point out the manner in which the board, a Dominion creation, has dealt and should deal with matters affecting not only Dominion corporations but municipal and provincial interests where, as in this case, it becomes necessary.

The controlling interest recognized by the board is that of the public, irrespective entirely of the accident whether that preponderating interest is either represented by or supports a Dominion or provincial company.

The question as to whether or not railway crossings should or should not be allowed is governed by the consideration of that predominating interest—whether that public interest be local, provincial, or dominion in character.

The crossing is a crossing which, in the interests of public safety, sooner or later should be protected. The board is able to contribute 20 per cent of its cost, with an ultimate limit of $5,000.

Under the authorities, there is no doubt but that the township of Barton can be called upon to contribute. The highway at the crossing in question is its highway. Its interest, however, is small compared with that of the other parties; and I think it should be asked to contribute only the comparatively small share of 7½ per cent of the cost remaining after the contribution that may be made from the fund has been deducted. The Grand Trunk Railway Company should contribute 32½% of the remainder. The city municipality, under its agreement on file with the board, has bound itself to pay one-half the cost of protection by gates and watchmen when necessary. The maintenance of gates and watchmen capitalized means a considerable cost amounting to $30,000 or $35,000. The subway affords a much better protection; and the city is also directly interested in the application, which is, indeed, made as a result of the agreement which it entered into with the Street Railway Company. Therefore, having regard to the estimated cost of the subway, I think, a fair proportion, say 25%, should be placed upon the city; and the remaining 35% should be paid by the Street Railway Company—the granting of whose application makes the structure necessary in the present instance. It may be said that this sum will be less than what the cost of a proper subway, carrying the street railway double tracks under the railway lands and apart from all highway accommodation, would amount to. Owing to the fact, however, that its franchise is not perpetual, and that it gets only a restricted right in the present subway, instead of the interest which it would have in one constructed on its own right-of-way, the percentage now fixed is fair.

Money by-laws may, of course, be passed by the interested municipalities, under the provisions of The Municipal Act 1913, S. 289, ss. f, without the assent of the electors.

Mr. Commissioner Goodeve concurred.

Ordered accordingly.

MOOSEJAW BOARD OF TRADE'S COMPLAINT *re* COAL RATES.

Judgment, Chief Commissioner DRAYTON, December 5, 1915:

This is an application made by the Moosejaw Board of Trade.

The request is for an order directing a substantial reduction in the freight rate on coal from the Drumheller coal mines to Moosejaw. The application states the distance to be 464 miles and the present rate $3 a ton.

The application further goes on to say that, when compared with other rates made in the decision in the Western Rates Case, the rate seems excessive; and that, when compared with the rate from Drumheller to Regina, it appears to be discriminatory against Moosejaw. The application further states that the rate on coal from Drumheller to Regina, a distance of approximately 31 miles further, is $2.90.

The application is correct in giving the mileage from Drumheller to Moosejaw, and also the rate.

The application, however, is probably launched in error of the manner in which coal is hauled on the Canadian Northern Railway to Regina. Drumheller coal to Regina moves along the rails of the Canadian Northern entirely, through Saskatoon, that company by that method obtaining the benefit of the entire haul. If coal was taken in the same way by the Canadian Northern to Moosejaw, over its own lines, it would mean that coal on arrival at Regina would continue easterly to Maryfield; thence westerly by way of Lampman and Radville to Moosejaw.

The result is that so far as a movement on the Canadian Northern is concerned, the fact is not as alleged that the haul to Regina is 31 miles longer, but on the contrary the haul to Moosejaw would be 372 miles longer than the haul to Regina. This, of course, would be an absurd movement. The proper movement, in the interest of the consumer, to Moosejaw, is that under which the coal actually moves, which means that it is taken by the Canadian Northern to Conquest where it is turned over to the Canadian Pacific, with the effect that the haul which would be by the all Canadian Northern route 847 miles, becomes 446 miles.

It is a well known principal that a joint service covering as it has to the transfer services from one railway to the other, and duplicate accounting, is more expensive than a service on a single line.

Under the Western Freight Rates Judgment an extra charge is allowed amounting to 20 cents a ton to cover this extra expense. This extra 20 cents a ton is probably a difference which has appeared to the applicants as being unreasonable, owing to the fact that the movement which has actually taken place was not before them. If the Regina coal had moved through Moosejaw for the further distance as the application would show, there undoubtedly would be some grounds for complaint. In view of the actual circumstances, there are none.

It is, of course, idle to attempt to compare rates one with the other on a strict mileage basis, the cost per mile varying, particularly in the coal business, very greatly having regard to the length of the haul. To illustrate this fact, while the rate to Regina is as shown but $2.90 the rate to Avonlea which takes the full Canadian Northern rate, and is about double the distance that Regina is from Drumheller, being only some 30 odd miles south of Moosejaw, is $4.

Commissioner McLean concurred.

ENQUIRY OF A. B. BUCKWORTH, VANCOUVER, B.C., IF THE BOARD HAS ANY JURISDICTION OVER RATES CHARGED BY THE CONSTRUCTION DEPARTMENT FOR HAULING FREIGHT OVER LINES NOT OPEN FOR TRAFFIC.

Judgment, Mr. Commissioner MCLEAN, December 8, 1914:

The shipments in question moved from Ymir, B.C., on the Great Northern, to Lafleche and Shaunavon on the C.P.R. At the time of the movement, which was in

March of the present year, the line between Assiniboia and Lafleche and Shaunavon was in the hands of the construction department, and no through rates to Lafleche and Shaunavon were at the time operative. The shipments were billed to Assiniboia at 35 cents per 100 lbs., which was the proper rate under the tariff. Beyond to Lafleche and Shaunavon the standard 10th class rate was added. This gave, in the case of Shaunavon, a total rate of 49 cents, while in the case of Lafleche there was a total rate of 41 cents.

Reference is made by the applicant to the fact that by Supplement 27 to C.P.R.C.R.C. W-1806, effective June 24, the through rate from Nelson to Shaunavon is 37 cents, while from Nelson to Lafleche it is 35 cents. As a matter of fact, these rates had been put in at an earlier date, effective May 5, by Supplement 26 to the already mentioned tariff. The rate from Ymir being 2 cents over Nelson, would give to Shaunavon a rate of 39 cents and to Lafleche a rate of 37 cents, which rates, however, were not published by the Great Northern until issuance of its Supplement 8 to C.R.C. 977, effective July 1, 1914. The rates as charged are complained of as being prohibitive, and claim for refund is made.

The portion of the line over which the movement to Lafleche and Shaunavon is concerned was opened for traffic by Order No. 21227 of January 19, 1914. A speed limit was imposed, which was removed by Order No. 21785 of May 8, 1914. The Canadian Pacific did not show stations on this line west of Assiniboia until May 1, this being done by their Supplement 9 to C.R.C. W-1914. The effect of this was to put into operation the following mileage tariffs:

C.R.C. No. W 1916, Brick, clay, gravel, sand and stone.
" " " 1734, Butter, eggs, cheese, and dressed meats.
" " " 1556, Posts, rails, and poles for fencing purposes.
" " " 1810, Cordwood and slabs.
" " " 1339, Live hogs for packing and reshipment.
" " " 1745, Live stock.
" " " 1823, Grain, flour, vegetables, etc.
" " " 1443, Merchandise.

The situation in the present application is on all fours with what is set out in the complaint of the Riverside Lumber Company, in connection with the rates charged by the Canadian Pacific on its Weyburn-Lethbridge branch from Viceroy to Assiniboia, File 8262-42. In the present application, as in the application of the Riverside Lumber Company, the railway was for a period of time operated by the construction department. Here, as in the Riverside Lumber Company's complaint, there was in existence standard mileage sufficient to cover the additional mileage as soon as opened for traffic. Consequently, with opening for traffic from Assiniboia to Shaunavon, the standard tariffs and the rates thereunder were legally in effect. As pointed out, in dealing with the Riverside Lumber Company's complaint, the board is not concerned with the distinction between the construction and operating departments. What is of importance, regardless of how the traffic was handled, is whether the provisions of the Railway Act in regard to tolls have been complied with.

The standard rates were the only rates which were legally effective at the time the traffic moved. The special tariff under which the lumber rates became effective did not become operative until May 5. The lumber rates, as pointed out in the complaint of the Riverside Lumber Company, are special rates which within their territory are of general applicability, and do not vary from one portion of such territory to another with differences in condition of the traffic or cost of operation.

There is not before the board anything to show what justification, if any, there was for the delay between January 19, 1914, and May 5, 1914, in putting into operation the said rates. It is within the position laid down in the complaint of the Riverside Lumber Company to say that the portion of the road having been opened for

traffic between Assiniboia and Shaunavon, the delay in installiug these rates created an unjust discrimination. But the declaratiou cannot go any further. The board has no power to direct a refund. The rates complained of as discriminatary have beeu removed and with them the cause of complaint has also been removed.

Chief Commissioner Drayton concurred.

AN APPLICATION OF THE YUKON GOLD COMPANY, UNDER SECTIONS 26 AND 167, FOR AN ORDER REQUIRING THE KLONDIKE MINES RAILWAY COMPANY, AT ITS OWN EXPENSE, TO ELEVATE ITS TRACKS TO AN AVERAGE HEIGHT OF FIFTEEN FEET ABOVE THEIR PRESENT LEVEL OVER THE FOLLOWING SECTIONS OF THE RAILWAY SITUATE IN BONANZA CREEK, IN THE YUKON TERRITORY, NAMELY, FROM THE UPPER LINE OF CLAIM 80 TO THE LOWER BOUNDARY LINE OF CLAIM 97 BELOW DISCOVERY, AND FROM THE UPPER BOUNDARY LINE OF CLAIM 20 TO THE LOWER BOUNDARY LINE OF CLAIM 29 BELOW DISCOVERY.

Oral judgment delivered by Chief Commissioner DRAYTON at the close of the hearing, December 9, 1914:

The conclusion we have come to is that it would be improper at the moment to deal with this matter one way or the other. So far as the railway company is concerned, it is not suffering any damage—perhaps I should not say any damage; but it is, at any rate, suffering very little damage by reason of the action of the Placer Mining Company. It is not operating; at present it is performing no public service; and the interference with its track constitutes no public evil. Apparently the mining company also is not worried very much by the fact that the rails are in its way. It has gone on irrespective of the rails; it has run its works over the railway company's tracks, and is continuing its operations.

I do not know why we should interfere in any way in case of the railway company. Supposing that its contract is entirely unenforceable; supposing that everything that has been said in its behalf is correct—I cannot see why we should interfere in case of the company, in the absence,—as here there is a total absence,—of any public interest. I have no doubt the Yukon courts know a great deal more about mining business than we do. This whole questiou is now up before them; and it may be that we shall never have to deal with it at all.

So far as the railway interests are concerned, it is obvious that we shall never have to deal with this matter unless the Treadgold proposition becomes a reality, and unless there is the development which is talked about as immiuent and the business offers. So far as the mining company is concerned, it is not in need of an order at present; it is not now operating; it is closed down for the season; and if the Yukon courts deliver a judgment restraining the company from carrying on its work properly we will then take the matter up and consider it on the evidence now before us, with such other statements as counsel may desire to make, explaining the action of the courts, should that action be as I indicate.

While the matter is left as just stated, I may add that the board will not do anything to prevent the railway company from carrying out its contract, should it desire to do so. In other words, on the railway company filing an appropriate application for leave to re-locate its line, an order will be made without the formality of another hearing.

APPLICATION OF MESSRS. S. A. HAMILTON COMPANY, LTD., OF MOOSEJAW, SASK., FOR A TRANSFER TRACK BETWEEN THE CANADIAN NORTHERN AND CANADIAN PACIFIC RAILWAY COMPANIES AT HAWICK, ALBERTA, OR, AS AN ALTERNATIVE, AN ORDER FOR THE ISSUANCE OF A JOINT FREIGHT TARIFF ON COAL BY THE CANADIAN NORTHERN RAILWAY AND CANADIAN PACIFIC RAILWAY COMPANIES BETWEEN DRUMHELLER AND MOOSEJAW, SASK., VIA THE CITY OF CALGARY, ALBERTA.

Oral judgment delivered by Assistant Chief Commissioner SCOTT at the close of the hearing, December 10, 1914.

Mr. Hamilton, a coal merchant in Moosejaw, is interested in the sale of coal mined at Drumheller, on the line of the Canadian Northern. He has told us that the service of the Canadian Northern via Delisle to Conquest, where a transfer is made to the Canadian Pacific, which company brings it into Moosejaw, is rather slow; and he suggests that, instead of the coal going east on the Canadian Northern it might go west a short distance from Drumheller to Hawick, where the connection is applied for with the Canadian Pacific. It could then be brought in over the Canadian Pacific to Moosejaw.

It appears that this transfer is asked for only for the purpose of this coal. There is no other public necessity that we have heard of which would require a transfer at this point.

The Drumheller mine is on the Canadian Northern. As it moves at present the Canadian Northern has the long haul. It is customary to let the railway upon whose line an industry is established, have the long haul. In fact I think they would make it very inconvenient if the shippers tried to send the coal in any other way.

Mr. Warren of the Canadian Northern has undertaken to say that there will not be the loss of time in the future that has occurred in the past.

The transfer at Hawick, we are told, would cost something like $4,500 to install, and then there would be some cost in maintenance.

We do not feel justified under the present circumstances in putting that cost upon the railway companies. The railway companies would ultimately get that amount out of the public in the end in their rates; and, at the present time, it is undesirable that any additional burden should be put upon the railway companies, which undoubtedly would reflect back upon the public in the course of time. Unless the mine owners are so anxious that they will come forward and pay the cost of the connection, we feel that we should not order it. In municipalities, cities, and towns, there are many industries that pay a great deal more than $4,500 for railway facilities. It might be possible for these mine owners to get together and pay that amount. However, there is no such offer as that before us, and on the present facts the application is dismissed.

APPLICATION OF THE CITY OF WINNIPEG FOR A SUBWAY AT MAPLE STREET, WINNIPEG, MANITOBA.

Oral judgment delivered by Assistant Chief Commissioner SCOTT at the close of the hearing, December 12, 1914:

Some years ago Maple street from a point about 92 feet north from the northerly boundary of Higgins avenue was closed and conveyed to the Canadian Pacific by by-law passed by the city of Winnipeg.

The Canadian Pacific Railway Company is now spending a great deal of money in improving their station facilities in Winnipeg. They are elevating their tracks and providing, among other things, baggage facilities underneath the tracks on a lower level than the level of Higgins avenue. They are providing an approach into their baggage room from Higgins avenue over Maple street as it exists and then over the property which formerly was Maple street, but which is now the property of the Canadian Pacific. This approach is for vehicular traffic, express wagons going to and from the baggage station.

The city of Winnipeg doubtless moved by the excavation they had seen on the ground thought it wise to endeavour to get Maple street, which was closed by by-law some years ago, re-opened and carried through under the elevated tracks of the Canadian Pacific so that they would have a subway for travel north and south in addition to the subway which they now have at Main street to the west and in addition to the subways to the east at Rachel street and Higgins avenue.

There is undoubtedly a great deal of travel on the streets of the city of Winnipeg north and south, and the people of Winnipeg are undoubtedly seriously handicapped by the lack of communication from the north to the south on the west side of Main street.

It is suggested that, if Maple street was opened it would relieve the rather heavy travel on Main street. I think that is true, and if it were possible without destroying or materially injuring the very excellent plan which the railway company has prepared to handle this business at this enlarged station, to open Maple street through, I would feel inclined, upon proper compensation being paid the railway company, to accede to the city's request. But the railway company produces its plans, explains the work it has actually done, and shows that it requires all the space shown on these plans for baggage purposes.

The suggestion of the city is that that baggage room might be shortened up and that wagons going to and from the baggage room, instead of using the property which was once Maple street to stand upon, should back into the west of it and thus allow a free passage through the company's property which was once Maple street.

We think that the railway company's plans cannot be changed without injury to the public interest. It is very much in the interest of the public, that proper facilities be provided for the handling of baggage.

This board is giving a good deal of thought to station facilities in connection with the station which it is hoped at some date will be erected at Toronto, and we realize that it is very important in the public interest that ample space be given for the handling of baggage. We think that the baggage room would be too small if the city's suggestion were carried out. While we would like to have seen a passageway through here for vehicles, we do not think it can be granted. It is a question of the interest of the travelling public. It is not the facility of the Canadian Pacific so much as it is the facility of the public. The Canadian Pacific is not going to have its office there. It is not going to use the property for its own exclusive use. It is not going to use it to collect revenue of any kind. It is providing this large concourse in the front of its baggage room in the public interest that the public may be able to go to and from the baggage room. As has been pointed out, there is no additional revenue to the Canadian Pacific, except in increased business to be gained by spending the money it is spending in improving its facilities.

Under these conditions, we do not think it would be proper for us to take any of that land away from it for a vehicular subway at Maple street.

We think, however, that a pedestrian passageway can be put through there. The letter of the vice-president of the company to the mayor has been read, and Mr. Sullivan to-day has said that the company is willing to give a passageway through there for pedestrians. I think that will be of material assistance to the people of Winnipeg. Instead of having to walk over to Main street to go through that subway they can pass through here. It does not matter so much when you are driving because it only means sitting in the conveyance a few seconds longer; but walking there is a difference of course.

It may be that, at some future date, if that Immigration Building is moved, a subway could be put through immediately to the east of the baggage concourse. That is a matter which will have to be taken care of in the future. It was first said the Immigration Building may be moved; then it was said it would not be moved at present. However, on the present lay-out, as I have said before, we feel that it is not practical or in the public interest to open a vehicular way through on the line of the continuation of Maple street.

If the parties cannot agree upon the character of the pedestrian way through there, if either of them will refer the matter to the board, we will go into it and see that a proper pedestrian subway is provided; but probably the railway company will be able to satisfy the city in that regard.

The application is refused.

Mr. HUNT: Except as to the pedestrian way.

The ASSISTANT CHIEF COMMISSIONER: Except as to the pedestrian way.

THE RAILWAY COMPANIES WILL BE REQUIRED TO JUSTIFY THE PROPOSED CANCELLATION, JANUARY 1ST, OF THE ARRANGEMENTS WHEREBY MIXED CARLOADS OF FOREIGN AND NATIVE LIQUORS, AND MIXED CARLOADS OF 5TH CLASS GROCERIES AND 4TH CLASS DRIED FRUITS ARE CARRIED AT THEIR RESPECTIVE CARLOAD RATES BETWEEN POINTS WEST OF INCLUDING PORT ARTHUR, AND THERETO FROM EASTERN SHIPPING POINTS.

Oral judgment delivered by Chief Commissioner DRAYTON at the close of the hearing, December 12, 1914:

It may be that, academically speaking, Mr. Shaw is quite right and that what Mr. Dewey has said is correct; but I do not know of any academic rates (if there are any, I see no reason why they should continue); and it may be that by the improper process, academically speaking, a rate obtains here which is entirely just as a rate, but entirely wrong academically.

It seems to me that, when the work was done which the board has been given to understand was in connection with an attempt, which may or may not be successful, but is made in good faith, with a view to arrive at a more rational and just classification,—it might reasonably have been expected that such changes in the classification as are now proposed would have been postponed till the time when the general re-classification scheme was submitted.

As the matter now stands, it rather looks as if any action taken by the board to-day might tie its hands in dealing with the principle of the new classification, as undoubtedly it will be called upon to do.

There are other interests besides those represented here to-day, which interests have not been heard; but they say they are sending on their written statements; and for that reason, as well as for the classification reasons I have referred to, all that we will do now is to suspend this proposed cancellation until further order. This action does not deprive the companies of the right to have the matter dealt with on its merits—not on a technical point, as it was dealt with in Montreal. We are not in any way pre-judging what is going to be done on the main issue.

Further. Referring to Mr. Shaw's statement regarding the effect of the decision in the western rates case upon the revenues of the railway companies, I may say that it is difficult to see how any action we could take in this case, with a view to the increase of revenues, could very well be justified in view of the finding in the said western rates case.

APPLICATION OF THE CANADIAN NORTHERN RAILWAY COMPANY FOR AUTHORITY TO REMOVE THE CONNECTION BETWEEN THE CANADIAN PACIFIC RAILWAY COMPANY AND THE WINNIPEG JOINT TERMINAL TRACKS AT HIGGINS AVENUE, WINNIPEG, MANITOBA.

Oral judgment delivered by Assistant Chief Commissioner SCOTT at the close of the hearing, December 12, 1914:

The Canadian Northern Railway Company which is the successor in title to the Winnipeg Transfer Company, applies for the right to cut out the connection with the Canadian Pacific at the north end of the Transfer Company's line just west of Gomma street and north of Higgins avenue. The Canadian Pacific Railway Company is indifferent in the matter. There are four parties whose property lies north of Higgins avenue who say that the transfer track has been used as a service track from the Canadian Pacific to their industries for a number of years. The original connection was made pursuant to an order of the railway committee of the Privy Council on the 29th of November, 1890. Subsequent to that date these parties commenced to enjoy the privilege of having switching done from the Canadian Pacific to their industries. We do not know exactly when, but for a considerable number of years they have enjoyed this privilege.

The Canadian Northern Railway Company says that that was not the intention when this connection was made; that the original intention was that the line was to be used for transfer only.

Mr. Ashdown says that at the time the right of way was acquired from him through lots 9 and 10 on the north of Higgins avenue, it was understood he was to have the right of service from the Canadian Pacific tracks.

The Canadian Northern points out that in the deed from Mr. Ashdown to the railway company that condition does not appear. However, Mr. Warren very fairly says that if Mr. Ashdown makes that statement he is not prepared to dispute it.

Apparently, the only prejudice to the Canadian Northern by the continuance of this arrangement is that they are losing a certain amount of revenue. If the connection were taken out these parties would have to be served from the Canadian Pacific through the Canadian Northern, and the Canadian Northern would get the switching allowed by the interswitching order.

We feel that these parties having enjoyed the switching from the Canadian Pacific for a certain length of time, whether it is a right or privilege, should be allowed to continue that right or privilege, and we feel that a proper compensation can be made to the Canadian Northern for the continuance of this right or privilege.

It being decided, therefore, that the Canadian Northern application to remove the connection is refused, the only point remaining is to decide how the Canadian Northern should be compensated.

I think the principle having once been decided that these parties are to continue to have switching service from the Canadian Pacific, that the railway companies can get together and agree upon the use of the track north of Higgins avenue on a joint arrangement. It may be that the parties should pay so much per car for the Canadian Pacific bringing the cars in there, or it may be that some portion of the capital account could be paid by these parties and they receive the right in perpetuity.

Whatever arrangement is made, it seems to me that we should not decide now how that should be done. The parties, the two railways and the parties interested, should have an opportunity of thinking the matter over, getting together if they can, and, if not, notifying the board and we will fix how the railway company is to be compensated.

An order will, therefore, go refusing the application and stating that the four parties north of Higgins avenue, that is, the Wilkinson Company, the Dyson Company, the Sawyer-Massey Company, and Mr. Ashdown, are to continue to have this privilege upon terms to be fixed.

If, as I have said, the parties cannot agree upon the terms, the board will fix them; but we would rather that the parties should try and get together. If they cannot get together, let them make a submission to the board of what they think would be fair.

Mr. WARREN: Might I ask if your decision is that you are practically ordering a joint section?

The ASSISTANT CHIEF COMMISSIONER: We are ordering the continuance of the service that these people have had there by joint section or by a payment per car on a wheelage basis, or something of that kind; but we are not deciding now how the matter is to be worked out.

Mr. WARREN: Until arrangements are made with the Canadian Pacific, that are agreeable to the Canadian Pacific and the Canadian Northern, we have the privilege to keep the Canadian Pacific off from there?

The ASSISTANT CHIEF COMMISSIONER: No. An account of the cars is to be kept, and whatever arrangement you make will be effective from to-day.

Mr. WARREN: In other words, it is practically ordering a joint section.

The ASSISTANT CHIEF COMMISSIONER: I have told you what we are ordering.

Now, you gentlemen interested in this assure us, you can keep a strict account of all the Canadian Pacific cars brought in there. We want that done. You must be

prepared to submit a statement to the railway companies and to the board whenever called upon.

Mr. LESUEUR: Yes.

Mr. WARREN: And what would you say that they should pay for the back ones?

The ASSISTANT CHIEF COMMISSIONER: This is to be effective from to-day. We say nothing in reference to back ones.

COMPLAINT OF THE MUNICIPALITY OF NORTH HIMSWORTH, HAVING REFERENCE TO THE ENCROACHMENT THE DOCK SIDING OF THE GRAND TRUNK RAILWAY COMPANY HAS MADE ON MAIN STREET, CALLANDER, ONT.

Judgment, Chief Commissioner DRAYTON, December 15, 1914:

The complaint was opposed by the railway company on the ground that the track had not been objected to by the municipality and had been laid for many years.

The railway company was unable to find records as to the location of the track, and submitted that, in view of the admitted age of the construction, the board should assume that track was located under proper authority and consent.

An inspection was had by an engineer of the board, from which it appeared that, at the crossing of Burritt street, Main street has at present a width of about eighteen feet, a portion of which was taken up by sidewalk, with the result that when two vehicles required to pass at the point one of them usually took part of the sidewalk and that in wet weather the sidewalk was consequently covered with mud. The report of the engineer suggested the widening of Main street by an additional twelve feet on the west side, as shown on the plan, and that the sidewalk should be reconstructed.

Mr. Moon, clerk of the municipality, who was present at the inspection, was of the view that, if an additional twelve feet was provided, the municipality would be satisfied. Subsequently the board received a letter from Mr. Moon advising the board that the council had passed the following resolution:

> "That this council accept plan of proposed widening of Main street by Grand Trunk Company, the railway company to procure land, build the street, and place concrete sidewalk on the west side."

The board directed the company to do the work. Subsequently the following letter was received from the railway company;

> "We have been endeavouring to purchase the land required to carry out the wishes of the board regarding the widening of Main street at the point in question, but the price asked, 50 cents per square foot, is so exorbitant that we do not see our way to pay it.
>
> "The owners are—
>
> "1. Mr. J. R. Moon, township clerk, North Himsworth, owner of lot 7, of which we require 862 feet, for which he asks $431. His lot, 69 feet by 132 feet, is assessed $350 for buildings and $225 for land.
>
> "2. Mr. Windsor, owner of lot 8, of which we require 610 square feet, for which he asks $310. His lot, 56 feet by 132 feet, is assessed, land $225, buildings $125, total $350. We also require to take from lot 9, owned by Mr. Windsor, 198 square feet, for which he asks $99. The lot, 66 feet by 132 feet, is assessed at $225, buildings $250.
>
> "None of the buildings will be interfered with. Under the circumstances we would like to be advised whether the board will consent to the matter standing until the owners are ready to accept a reasonable price, or do they desire us to apply for an order under section 178 of the Railway Act, authorizing us to expropriate the land required?"

As the widening was necessary in the public interest, the board instructed the company that the work must proceed, and an application has since been received

from the railway company for an order allowing the company to take the lands required for the street widening from the owners interested, Mr. J. R. Moon and Mr. W. T. Windsor. The land owners have been served and their reply received by the board. They object to an order for expropriation going on the ground that it would necessitate the moving of houses, thereby injuring gardens and flower plots, and that the railway company has made no offer to compensate.

The railway company states that the taking of the land does not involve the moving of any house. The land owners are fully protected in any objections which they make by the provisions of the Railway Act. The work is a work of public convenience which the private interests of the landowners cannot overrule.

The order may go.

Deputy Chief Commissioner Nantel concurred.

APPLICATION OF THE FORT WILLIAM BOARD OF TRADE FOR AN ORDER DIRECTING THE CANADIAN PACIFIC RAILWAY COMPANY TO PROVIDE LOCAL FREIGHT SHEDS AT FORT WILLIAM, SEPARATE FROM WHARF SHEDS.

Oral judgment delivered by Assistant Chief Commissioner SCOTT at the close of the hearing December 16, 1914:

With regard to the application of the Fort William Board of Trade with reference to the facilities at the freight sheds for local freight, we have had the advantage of going over the question on the ground with our operating officer.

It is true that the present facilities at the northeast end are perhaps a little too congested so far as the approach is concerned, and the space for teams to stand on is not very large. The shed itself is amply large to handle any business provided that the doors and the platform enabled enough teams to get there. So far as the present volume of freight is concerned, there does not appear to be any congestion. Mr. Murphy has shown us a plan, however, showing a complete change of method. Instead of handling the local freight from the northeast, they will handle it from the southwest end of the freight shed of number 5. This cannot be done at the moment, because the subway under the railway track leading off Syndicate avenue has not been paved. An agreement was made some time ago between the city and the railway with regard to the construction of the subway. We are told that the city agreed to pave it; but that they have had some difficulty from the legal point of view in providing the money. As I have already pointed out, I think there is a method,—I think there are several methods—whereby the city could be empowered to legally get the money for the paying of its share of that work.

I cannot see that the railway company is in any way to blame for the delay in the paving provided the statement is correct that, under the agreement, the city was to do it.

When the subway is paved, and I think no delay should occur on the part of the city in putting itself in a position whereby it can have that done, then the Canadian Pacific can provide much better accommodation for handling local freight. There are now two doors at the southwest end, but our operating officer, after discussing the matter with Mr. Murphy, advises us that the railway company can provide more than those two doors, perhaps three or perhaps four, and we think that, so far as the tonnage at present presenting itself is concerned, with this improvement there will be ample accommodation for handling the local freight of Fort William, both incoming and outgoing. It seems to us that, when Syndicate Avenue subway is in a position where it can be used, the present shed will be a very convenient spot to handle promptly the local freight both in and out.

Therefore, the application is dismissed.

We will see, of course, that the improvements are made, just as soon as the subway is in shape. I have no doubt, however, that the railway company will make the improvements without the intervention of the board; but if it does not—if notified—we

will see that the railway company does make a change and provide as good facilities as possible at the southwest end of the shed.

Mr. DOWLER: Will you permit me to ask that, in a sense, the dismissal should be considered as without prejudice? I suppose probably it is that way legally anyway. We may renew it?

The ASSISTANT CHIEF COMMISSIONER: Certainly.

Mr. DOWLER: We can renew it when we see the effect of the change that they have made.

The ASSISTANT CHIEF COMMISSIONER: You are perfectly free to come back to the board at any time if you find the change they contemplate making is not satisfactory.

COMPLAINT OF D. A. BROWNLEE, RICHMOND, ONT., AND W. F. GARLAND, M.P., *re* COAL RATES.

Judgment, Mr. Commissioner McLEAN, December 24, 1914:

Complaint is made that in the shipment of coal from the Lehigh Valley Coal Company of Syracuse, N.Y., to Richmond, Ont., there is charged by the Canadian Northern, all rail, for its portion of the haul from Ottawa to Richmond, a distance of 19 miles, a rate of 60 cents. The rate in question is taken from a mileage commodity tariff specially applicable to coal. The tariff being one in which mileage grouping is used, the appropriate distance on which to base the rate is 20 miles.

As shown by the freight bill submitted with the complaint, the car, which is used as the basis of the complaint, moved from Coxton via the New York Central System, arriving in Ottawa over the Ottawa and New York railway, which is controlled by the New York Central System.

The applicant's complaint, while directed at the particular charge made by the Canadian Northern, is more particularly concerned with the allegation that formerly when he shipped to Stittsville by the Canadian Pacific and then hauled the coal by wagon to Richmond he received "Ottawa rates".

The reference to "Ottawa rates" by the applicant must be in error. The tariffs on the board's files show that from June, 1904, to May, 1906, the Stittsville rate from Prescott was 30 cents per net ton higher than to Ottawa; from May, 1906, to February, 1910, it was 17 cents higher; while from February 10, 1910, to date, it has been 8 cents higher. The Canadian Pacific has not had, so far as the board's records show, any through rates from the mines.

In the case of a Canadian Pacific movement, the coal might move from Prescott either via Kempton and Smith's Falls, in which case the Stittsville mileage is 21 miles greater than the Ottawa mileage; or it may move via Ottawa, in which case it is 15 miles greater than the Ottawa mileage. In practice, the movement is through Ottawa.

While exception is taken to the charge for the Canadian Northern, this in reality relates itself to the total charge the applicant is now paying. For the reference is to the situation as it was when the Canadian Pacific to Stittsville was used.

The following check shows the rate situation in a movement to Stittsville and a movement to Richmond, the computations being on a gross ton basis:

To Stittsville.	
Coxton to Ogdensburg	$2 35 per ton.
Ferry, Ogdensburg to Prescott	0 20 "
C.P.R., Prescott to Stittsville	0 84 "
	$3 39 "
To Richmond.	
Coxton to Ottawa, via O. & N. Y. Ry	$2 70 per ton.
C.N.R., Ottawa to Richmond	0 67½ "
	$3 37½ "

When the through rate charge formerly made is compared with that now applicable, it appears that the situation is slightly better so far as rail charge is concerned. This omits consideration of any costs appertaining to the wagon haul from Stittsville

to Richmond. Since, then, the situation as to the total rail charge is slightly better, it does not appear that the portion of the charge accruing to the Canadian Northern has injuriously affected the applicant. For it is the total rate charge on the coal, not the way in which the railways participate in this charge, which is of importance to the applicant. It does not therefore appear that the applicant is injured.

Chief Commissioner Drayton concurred.

COMPLAINT OF THE INDEPENDENT VAN & STORAGE CO., LTD., *re* RATES ON HOUSEHOLD EFFECTS

Judgment, Commissioner McLean, December 28, 1914:

The figures submitted by the applicant are concerned with a limited number of cars; so, also, are the figures submitted by Mr. Beatty for the railway. It is impossible to say from these figures whether in the general run of cases the cars of household effects run above or below the minimum. The figures do show that in various cases a load considerably beyond the minimum can be carried. It does not follow that because on a particular car assembled in a particular way the minimum cannot be reached, the minimum is unreasonable for all cars of the same commodity, no matter how these cars are loaded.

Under the Transcontinental class tariff, shipments of household effects, "released" between Vancouver and points east of the Great Lakes, have a sixth class rating with a minimum of 20,000 lbs. the ordinary minimum attaching to this class being 24,000 lbs. In the case of shipments to points in the Prairie provinces, also in the case of shipments between points in these provinces, the sixth class rating with the normal minimum of 24,000 lbs. applies. But under the special tariffs applying on such a movement, the rate is approximately one-half that provided for by the class tariff.

The figures given by the applicant, as set out in Mr. McCaul's report, show for the four cars, 36 feet in length, a total load of 68,000 lbs., and a total minimum of 80,000 lbs. From the figures given, the load was 14 per cent short of the minimum. Mr. Beatty's letter of January 8 shows details for three 36-foot cars. The first two of these being concerned with movements between points west of the Lakes, took a minimum of 24,000 lbs.; the third took a minimum of 20,000 lbs., being concerned with a shipment to a point east of the lakes. The total minimum weight amounts to 68,000 lbs.; total loaded weight 80,620; that is to say, the loaded weight was 18 per cent over the minimum. If the first two of these cars had also been moving to a point east of the lakes, each of them would have had a minimum of 20,000 lbs. This would have given a corrected total minimum of 60,000 lbs.; and on the loading as given a loaded weight 34 per cent in excess of the minimum.

The practice of the applicants in combining less than carload shipments of different consignors into quantities taking a carload rate, said quantities being shipped by the applicant as consignor, is in contravention of the classification. Until it appears that there is valid ground for complaint on the part of consignors shipping household goods in accordance with the provisions of the classification, there does not appear to be justification for intervention by the board.

Assistant Chief Commissioner Scott concurred.

COMPLAINT OF A. H. MYLAND, CALGARY, ALTA., CONCERNING A CHARGE OF $3 PER CAR MADE BY THE CANADIAN PACIFIC RAILWAY COMPANY WHERE SHIPMENT OF CATTLE WAS TAKEN TO ACCOUNT AT CALGARY INSTEAD OF THE POINT OF DESTINATION ORIGINALLY SHIPPED TO.

Judgment, Mr. Commissioner McLean, January 5, 1915:

In the statement of the applicant, it is set out that quite a number of cars of live stock that are consigned to him are billed to points like Vancouver, Edmonton, Winnipeg, Toronto, Buffalo, etc., so that the buyer of the cattle may get the advantage of the through rate. The applicant complains that if such a car billed to a point beyond Calgary is sold in Calgary, $3 per car is charged by the railway, because the bill was

taken to account at Calgary instead of the destination point provided for in the original billing.

In the application of Hyde & Webster, in *re* Changing Destination of Carload Traffic in Transit, File 8659, the board by its decision of April 16, 1909, decided that the charge of $3 per car for changing destination of carload traffic in transit was proper, and in so deciding the board set out therein additional services which had to be performed by the railway in connection with the change in destination. These were:—

(1) A telegram to the agent at the point where the change is to be made must be sent. (2) The agent at that point must be on the lookout for the car. This may require his going to the van of each freight train that passes, in order to examine the conductor's records. (3) When the car is found, it must be relabelled. The way bill must be changed. The amount of charges usually must be varied, and the auditor's department notified. (4) Then the car must be got out of the train and put to one side. This will require shunting, switching, etc., which takes up the time of the train crew and causes delay to the rest of the train. The car must usually be picked up and put in another train going to the new point of destination. (5) The railway company must assume the legal responsibility of deciding whether the party asking to have the destination of the car changed owns the merchandise and has the right to deal with it.

Following this decision, provision as to charge per car set out in the judgment was embodied by the railway in its tariffs. The change which it is sought to collect here is set out in item 5, page 7 of C.R.C., W.-1983.

In the Hyde & Webster case, the change of destination in transit involved a movement beyond the original point of destination. In the present application, the shipment is stopped at Calgary short of the original point of destination. In both cases, the railway stands prepared to perform its contract of carriage. A change is made by the shipper. The question is, does the situation as developed at Calgary properly fall within the tariff provisions as to change of destination in transit?

The livestock contract and the waybill in connection therewith must, in the first instance, be made out for the point of destination named by the consigner. A copy of the waybill as made out will pass to the central auditing office of the railway at Montreal, and the point of destination will be debited with the charges from the point of shipment. If the car which is billed to a point beyond Calgary is held at Calgary, the original livestock contract must be taken up and the waybill taken to account at Calgary. The waybill must also be corrected. The records of the agent at the point of shipment must be corrected; and there must be a revision of the record already sent forward to the head office, said revision being necessary in order that the agent at the original destination point may be relieved and a proper debit as against the new point of destination may be made on the books.

In addition to the items of clerical and accounting expenses which are entailed by this change in transit, there is also to be taken into consideration the advantage a shipper receives from being able to treat such a point as Calgary as "an order" point; for, in substance, that is what the practice amounts to; the shipper is able to profit by the changes in market conditions which inure to his advantage.

Under the particular facts of the Hyde & Webster case, the new point of destination was located beyond the point of interception and beyond the original destination. But a situation where both the point of interception and the new destination are short of the original destination is also within the principle of the above judgment. In the present case, delivery is taken at a point of interception short of the original destination. The point of interception becomes the new destination. But whatever be the minor points of difference as between the particular facts of the Hyde & Webster case and those of the present case, they are insufficient to take the present application out from under the principle of the Hyde & Webster case. The charge, which is covered by tariff, was properly made.

Chief Commissioner Drayton, concurred.

SESSIONAL PAPER No. 20c

APPLICATION SHEPHARD LOCAL IMPROVEMENT DISTRICT COUNCIL NO. 12z4, FOR A HIGHWAY CROSSING OVER THE CANADIAN PACIFIC RAILWAY.

Judgment, Chief Commissioner DRAYTON, January 7, 1915:

On the application of the Shephard Local Improvement District Council, No. 12 Z4, Order 17511 was made allowing the applicants to construct a highway over the tracks of the Canadian Pacific on the township line described in the order. The highway was treated as a new highway, with the result that the cost incident thereto had to be borne by the District Council.

The matter was opened by a further application made by the District Council on October 24, 1912, in which application the council claimed that the crossing wanted was on a road allowance which was once opened and then for some reason closed by the Canadian Pacific. The company's reply to the application showed that the ditch (presumably the highway ditch), was filled in twice by the municipality and twice opened by the company in order to maintain the railway ditch; and that, in any event, the railway was unquestionably senior to the highway, so that the Company should not be at any cost in connection with the opening or re-opening of the crossing as the case might be.

No further action was taken by the applicants until the 29th of October, 1914, when the following letter from the Surveyors Department at Edmonton was forwarded:

> "In reply to your letter of the 14th instant, in connection with railway crossing on road allowance west of section 18-23-27-4. I beg to advise that I cannot find anything further on record, except that we have a letter from the Department of the Interior which says that the location plan of the main line of the Canadian Pacific Railway Company, which crosses this township, was signed by Mr. W. D. Barclay, Chief Engineer, on the 31st of January, 1885, and that township 23-27-4 was surveyed in August, 1883."

the applicants as a result, of course, contending that the cost of the crossing and its maintenance should be thrown upon the railway company.

The company in its answer stated that the railway was constructed and in operation in the year 1883 and that the township survey was not approved until July 4, 1884. The reply also calls attention to the fact that the director of surveys does not in his letter claim seniority for the road allowance, and that the only information he gives is the date on which the location plan was filed and the date on which the township was surveyed.

So that there might be no room for error, the board wrote the director of surveys at Edmonton with reference to his letter, stating that the railway company claimed that while its railway was constructed and in operation in the year 1883, the township survey was not approved until July 4, 1884, and that the board desired to be advised of the exact date when the plan of the township was approved and filed.

On December 22, the director of surveys advised the board that his office had not this information, but that it might be procured from the surveyor general of the Department of the Interior.

That department has since advised that the plan of the original survey of the township was approved and confirmed by the surveyor general on July 4, 1884, and mailed to the registrar of the Land Titles Office at Calgary on August 5, 1884. This would seem to settle beyond all doubt the time at which the survey became effective.

The files of the board do not go back far enough to ascertain when the Canadian Pacific line was constructed at the point in question. The crossing, however, is about 18 miles east of Calgary, and the report of Mr. Schreiber, chief Government engineer in charge of railways, on Canadian Pacific construction, showed that the railway had reached a point 40 miles west of Calgary in September, 1883.

On the evidence, the construction of the railway is senior at this point.

Commissioner McLean concurred.

INTERCHANGE TRACKS BETWEEN GRAND TRUNK PACIFIC RAILWAY COMPANY AND THE CANADIAN PACIFIC RAILWAY COMPANY, CALGARY, ALTA.

Judgment, Assistant Chief Commissioner SCOTT, January 7, 1915.

At the hearing of this matter at the recent sittings of the board in Calgary, representatives of the city and commercial interests in Calgary strongly urged the necessity for interchange between the tracks of the Canadian Pacific Railway Company and the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway Company at Calgary. From a statement put in it appears that there are 206 wholesale houses and industries at Calgary served with spur tracks by the Canadian Pacific Railway. It is, undoubtedly, in the interests of a large number of these concerns, as well as the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway Company, that the connection asked for be brought about. It is urged (and I think correctly so) by the Canadian Pacific Railway Company that the connection would not only be of no benefit to the company, but that it would probably result in it losing some of the business it now enjoys. However, it being so apparently in the public interest that connection should be brought about, the Canadian Pacific Railway Company do not oppose the matter very strongly on its merits, but urge that if an interchange track is ordered that no portion of the expense should be placed upon that company.

The Grand Trunk Pacific Railway Company, while it is anxious for the connection, frankly stated that, at present, it had no funds available out of which a capital account expenditure could be paid for. That company suggested that, if the connection was put in by the Canadian Pacific Railway Company, that the Grand Trunk Pacific would be willing to pay an annual amount as rental. Bearing in mind the position of the Canadian Pacific Railway Company in this matter, it seems to me that it would be unfair to ask that company to incur any outlay for the interchange.

The board considered a number of sites where an interchange track might possibly be constructed, and we finally decided that the best location for the interchange was just east of the Globe elevator. If the interchange is to be built, a strip of land could be acquired on the eastern side of the Globe Elevator property; or, on the west side of the Canadian Pacific Railway property which adjoins the elevator property. I think it well to say that the board will be satisfied with an interchange track on either of the two properties I have mentioned, so that the parties who may undertake to secure the land for the track would have an alternative location available in the case of their being unable to come to terms as to the other location.

As I have already stated, the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway Company contend that it has no funds available to pay for the work in question. I have no reason to doubt the accuracy of this statement. If the interchange track is ever to be put in, it should either be constructed by the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway Company or the commercial interests desiring it through the guardian of their interests, the municipal corporation. If the Grand Trunk Pacific won't undertake the work on either of the sites suggested—notwithstanding the fact that the board is willing to give it the right to expropriate either sites and have the value determined by arbitration—then the board is willing to issue an order to compel the Grand Trunk Pacific to construct the interchange on condition that the amount required to cover the cost of same be put up by the city, with the provision that the amount, with interest at 6 per cent be returned to the city by the railway company in payments of so much per car for every car that goes over the tracks in question. This rebate to the city would be at the rate of $5 per car for all cars loaded with merchandise of sixth class or higher; and, $3 per car on all cars loaded with merchandise at a rating of less than sixth class; with the provision, that the Grand Trunk Pacific is to secure a net revenue of at least $8 per car before the $5 or $3 above mentioned is to be apportioned to the city. If the revenue of the car is not

sufficient to provide $8 for the railway company and a rebate for the city, the latter must be reduced so as to insure the $8 revenue to the company.

I have said that the board will give the railway company the right to expropriate either the Globe Elevator Company or the Canadian Pacific Railway Company's property. The latter company urged that while its land is at present vacant, it will be required for future expansion. The Canadian Pacific Railway Company have a very large area of land available. I think it will be some considerable time before it will be required. But, assuming that it will be required at some future date, nevertheless, the public interest which requires this interchange is of paramount importance. If the Canadian Pacific Railway Company's property is taken that company must be treated as if it were a private land owner and it should receive proper compensation.

The question naturally arises as to how much of a deposit the city should be called upon to put up in the event of it deciding that it would avail itself of the suggestion made. The chief engineer of the board suggests that a deposit of $25,000 should be a sufficient sum to cover the purchase of the land and the construction of the tracks; but, I presume that that matter could probably be arranged amicably between the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway Company and the city, in the event of the city going on with the undertaking.

In deciding upon the location for the interchange, we have not overlooked the submission of the board of trade that a number of industries possessing Canadian Pacific Railway private sidings will be slightly outside the four-mile limit which governs interswitching. The board has the assurance of Mr. Lanigan, the traffic manager of the Canadian Pacific Railway Company, that his company will not take an unreasonable stand and demand a too strict interpretation of the interswitching order. In any event, the matter is entirely in the hands of the board and we can see that the Calgary interests which are more than four miles from the point of interchange will receive fair treatment.

No order will issue until the board has heard from the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway Company and the city in this matter. We think that an interchange at Calgary should be put in in the public interest; but, realizing the rather expensive cost and the position of the Grand Trunk Pacific, we do not feel inclined to order the railway company to incur this expense unless it is to receive such financial assistance as I have suggested.

Commissioner Goodeve concurred.

IN THE MATTER OF AN APPLICATION FOR AN ORDER TO REMEDY ARBITRARY AND DISCRIMINATING RATES ON BOTH FREIGHT AND PASSENGER TRAFFIC TO AND FROM FREDERICTON, N.B. (C. P. R. AND I. C. R.); AND APPLICATION OF THE CANADIAN PACIFIC RAILWAY COMPANY FOR A RE-HEARING IN CONNECTION WITH THE JUDGMENT ISSUED JULY 18, 1914.

Judgment, Mr. Commissioner McLEAN, January 7, 1915.

Under date of July 18, 1914, judgment was given dealing with the complaint of the Board of Trade of Fredericton, N.B., in regard to the arbitrary and discriminatory rates alleged to exist on passenger traffic to and from Fredericton. What is now material was set out in the judgment in the following language:

> "It was stated in evidence by Mr. Wells, for the railway, that, generally speaking, the fares from Fredericton were less than from St. John, except where the element of competition entered; and that wherever the rates were made on mileage Fredericton had a lower rate. It is apparent that where there is competition at St. John, which is not operative at Fredericton, it may bring about a lower rate basis at the former point. So long as the discrimination so created is not unjust, it is permitted by the Railway Act. However, while there

may be, on account of competition, a justification for a lower rate to a longer distance point, as, for example, Moncton, it does not follow that this justifies the granting of an identical rate to a shorter distance point where such competition does not exist. Yet the railway makes the Moncton rate the maximum to intermediate main line points, although it is not alleged that there is competition at these points.

"The Railway, in its answer has drawn attention to the established practice of fixing the rates to non-competitive points by adding the local fare to the junction point to the competitive fare. But this practice has not been applied in connection with the Moncton and St. John rates. The Moncton rate has been met because, as Mr. Wells stated, the railway wants to share in the business. The extension of this rate to St. John is ascribable to choice, not to competition. Further, in connection with the competitive rates from St. John, the rates are not limited to the point where the competition exists. They are also made applicable to main line stations. That is to say, the competitive rate is made a maximum for these stations, although it is not alleged that competition exists at them. On the other hand the practice as to branch line business is stated in the railway's answer to be as follows:

"In making the fares from points north and south of the main line, such as Fredericton, St. Stephen, St. Andrews and Woodstock, the fares were made by adding the one-way fare to the junction point to the competitive rate.

"While the existence of sufficiently potent competition at a particular point may be a justification sufficient to take the railway out from the inhibitions of the Railway Act in regard to discrimination if the same rate is not extended to another point where competition does not exist, that is not the situation which here exists. The railway from considerations of traffic policy has extended the advantage of the competitive rate to points where competition does not exist. On such a state of facts, the contention of Fredericton is well-founded; and so long as the condition exists as it is now spread before us, the St. John rates should be the maximum for Fredericton."

After the issuance of the judgment, a communication was received from the Canadian Pacific Railway Company alleging that through imperfection of presentation the matter had not been so developed before the board as to seize it of all the essential facts concerned. It was alleged that while the principle as set out in the above extract from the judgment might be accepted as operative in freight traffic, there were special conditions which, in this respect, differentiated the freight traffic from passenger traffic. It was stated that the practice of making the passenger fares to and from intermediate points such as not to exceed the fares to more distant points on the direct line was in general use over the North American continent and that in the application of this practice in the United States, no exception thereto had been taken by the Interstate Commerce Commission. The railway then applied for a reconsideration of the matter so that the facts pertinent to the matter might be fully developed in re-hearing.

On checking certain of the tariffs, it appeared that the practice was of more general use than had been apparent from what was presented before the board in the hearing at St. John. The checking of the tariffs showed, for example:

Second class $10 rate from St. John applies to all strictly intermediate stations to Montreal where 1st class is over $10; in other words, it backs eastwardly to Bury, Que., 54 miles inside the boundary.

To stations on the Drummondville branch (from Foster) the $10 rate also applies in competition with the I.C.R., Drummondville being on the I.C.R. main line to Montreal.

The situation is similar on the St. Hyacinthe branch from Farnham.

To stations on these branches intermediate to Drummondville, the $10 rate also applies.

To all other branch points not held down by I.C.R. competition, arbitraries are added to the $10 rate.

On consideration of what was submitted by the railway, as well as of what the tariffs showed, it seemed proper that the matter should be spoken to by the railways generally. Consequently the matter was set down for hearing on November 17, to be spoken to by the Canadian Pacific, Grand Trunk, Canadian Northern, Michigan Central, and the Toronto, Hamilton and Buffalo Railway Companies. Certain additional material in regard to the practice in the United States and the rulings of the Interstate Commerce Commission thereon was found to be necessary. The material in question is now before the board.

The matter as presented by the Canadian Pacific Railway Company in the hearing was of the nature of an elaboration of what had been set out in its letter above referred to. It had therein stated:—

> "It is quite practicable to charge a competitive rate for a freight shipment which is lower than the rate for such a shipment made to or from some intermediate point. The carrier has complete control of the freight which cannot be unloaded without its consent and cannot be billed from an intermediate point on payment of the lower rate from the point beyond.
>
> "On the other hand, however, a passenger can buy a through ticket at the lower rate to the farther competitive point and leave the train at any intermediate point where it stops, or he can send to the more distant competitive point for a ticket and board the train at an intermediate point where a higher fare applies.
>
> "Thus it will be seen that in so far as passenger fares are concerned, it is impracticable to put fares to intermediate points on the main line on a lower (higher)? basis than the fares applying to points beyond on the same line."

The Michigan Central showed that its practice was the same as the Canadian Pacific. The Grand Trunk, without adducing evidence, supported the same general position.

The fact that the practice may be of general use is, of course, not an answer to the allegation of discrimination. The question is whether the discrimination alleged is such as constitutes unjust discrimination or undue preference under the Railway Act.

In regard to the practice in the United States, the Act to Regulate Commerce, as amended June 8, 1910, provides in section 4 thereof—long and short haul clause—that

> " . . . it shall be unlawful for any common carrier, subject to the provisions of this Act, to charge or receive any greater compensation in the aggregate for the transportation of passengers, or of like kind of property, for a shorter than for a longer distance over the same line or route, in the same direction, the shorter being included in the longer distance . . . "

This prohibition is, however, qualified by a subsequent provision in the section whereby, upon application to the Interstate Commerce Commission, authorization may be obtained for charging less for longer than for shorter distances for the transportation of passengers or property.

Formerly, the long and short haul clause of the Act to Regulate Commerce was qualified by the words "substantially similar circumstances and conditions."

This difference in language, however, does not affect the description of the route over which the traffic concerned moves; so the decision given in Baer Bros. Mercantile Co. *vs.* Missouri Pacific Ry. Co., and Denver and Rio Grande Rd. Co., in April, 1908, 13 I.C.R., 336, is pertinent as showing the practice of the Interstate Commerce

Commission. It is true that this case was a freight case, but the provisions of the long and short haul clause apply to passenger traffic as well. In this case the traffic in question formerly passed through the city of Leadville, Colorado, and both freight and passenger trains of the railway were operated through that city. Subsequently, the route was changed so that the traffic was handled through a junction point known as Malta Junction, and the traffic into Leadville was thereafter handled over a branch line 4½ miles in length. The following words, which are to be found on page 336, are pertinent to the interpretation of what is meant by the description of the route under the long and short haul clause:—

> "Under these circumstances, we are inclined to hold that Leadville should not be treated as intermediate within the meaning of the fourth section. A town might be intermediate, although located some short distance from the line of the railway, so that the railway did not literally pass through it. But when, as in this case, the town is connected with the main road by a branch road, requiring a separate and independent service at considerable cost to reach it, it should not be regarded as intermediate.

More recently, in 1914, the Interstate Commerce Commission has dealt with this in *Dood* vs. *T. and P. Ry. Co., Unreported Opinion A-223.* In this, what was involved was a higher rate in effect on cotton wood from Annona, Texas, to Springfield, Missouri, a less distance than from Shroveport, Louisiana, to Kansas City, Missouri, a greater distance. The commission held that the points in question were not intermediate via the direct line or usual routes of movement, and the complaint of the violation of the fourth section of the Act to Regulate Commerce was dismissed.

The distinction as between the branch line movement and the main line movement has turned upon the scope of the discrimination concerned as delimited in section four. In addition, the commission has recognized that where there is dissimilarity of circumstances, it is not unlawful to charge somewhat higher rates from branch line stations to a particular point than from stations equally distant, on the main line, to the same point.

Logan *et al. vs.* Chicago and N.W. Ry. Co., 2 I.C.R., 431.

Board of Winston-Salem *vs.* N. and W. Ry. Co., 26 I.C.C., 151.

Page Milling Company *vs.* N. and W. Ry. Co., 30 I.C.C., 610.

So far as explicit statement is concerned, there does not appear to be any ruling on the particular phase of passenger rate regulation involved in the present application. The commission has indeed said in its Conference Rulings, 304, subsection F, of March 13, 1911, which will be found republished in its Conference Bulletin No. 6:—

> "That if a carrier is authorized to maintain rates to or from a given point which are not in conformity with the fourth section, it may establish rates upon branch lines connected with the main line at these points which are higher than such commodity rates by arbitraries, or by the branch line locals, without special authority from the commission."

This, however, applies to a case not where the longer distance rate is made a maximum, but where an exemption from the rigid application of the section is granted. But, inferentially, no greater concession to branch line points would be called for by the commission when the competitive rate is made a maximum by the carrier on the main line movement, than when the commission itself exempts the carrier from the necessity of so applying it. This inference is substantiated by the practice in regard to freight rates already adverted to. A particular example may be referred to as indicating the method of rate structure used in practice.

It appears that the present first-class fare between Chicago and Spokane is $46.10. This is a distance via St. Paul and short line movements of 1,885 miles. From Chicago to Spokane, via Union Pacific Route, moving through Omaha, Ogden, Pocatello, and

Umatilla Junction, is a distance of 2,415 miles. Where the movement is via Granger, the distance is slightly less, viz., 2,349 miles. In this case, in accordance with common practice, the short line makes the rate between initial and terminal points. In addition to this, the rate of the short line mileage is made the maximum to intermediate points in the case of a direct line movement where the ordinary mileage fare would be higher. But on a movement westward from Umatilla to Portland, a distance of 187 miles, the fares are made up by adding to the rate to Umatilla Junction the local rate beyond; that is to say, the competitive factor is limited to the portion of the route by the short line mileage.

While it does not appear that an explicit sanction has been given to this practice by the Interstate Commerce Commission, there does not appear to be anything in its decisions which finds it unjustifiable.

By Section 315 of the Railway Act of Canada, provision is made that—

> "All such tolls shall always, under substantially similar circumstances and conditions, in respect of all traffic of the same description, and carried in or upon the like kind of cars, passing over the same portion of the line of railway, be charged equally to all persons and at the same rate, whether by weight, mileage, or otherwise."

Sub-section 5 of the same section provides that—

> "The board shall not approve or allow any toll which for the like description of goods or for passengers carried under substantially similar circumstances and conditions, in the same direction, over the same line, is greater for a shorter than for a longer distance, within which such shorter distance is included, unless the board is satisfied that owing to competition it is expedient to allow such toll."

The board in the application of J. S. Mitchell & Co., dated February 1, 1911, file 16686, had before it a situation whereon a shipment to Boynton, Que., a higher rate was charged by the Boston & Maine than to Beebe Junction and Rock Island stations, which were further along the line. The situation was that to the further distant points commodity rates existed, while only the mileage rate was at the time available to Boynton, which is a flag station. The board, in dealing with this matter, held that since the circumstances were not shown to be dissimilar, and there being no plea that the lower rate for longer distance was attributable to competition, it had power to disallow the toll under sub-section 5 of Section 315.

As has been indicated, the C.P.R. makes the same rate to St. John as it makes to Moncton, the Moncton rate being made to meet the Intercolonial rate. It appears from tariffs on file with the board that the Intercolonial extends its Moncton rate to St. John.

The board has found that at St. John and at Montreal competitive conditions exist. On what was before it at the former hearing, it appeared that the extension of this competitive rate to intermediate points on the main line was a matter of mere gratuity on the part of the railway. On further consideration, in view of what has been submitted, this conclusion appears to have been in error. It appears that, in practice, an individual travelling to a point between St. John and Montreal, either Montreal or St. John being the initial point of the journey, can purchase a through ticket at either of these points, and then use it on his journey to the intermediate point. The effect of this is to cut out on the journey to the intermediate point the application of the mileage rate. It is also open to a traveller beginning his journey at a point intermediate to Montreal, for example, and travelling to Montreal, to send to St. John to purchase a ticket. He can then travel on this ticket to his destination; and the effect of this is that as to this journey the mileage rate is also cut out. This situation may

arise wherever the competitive rate is less than the mileage rate of the intermediate point in question. It was submitted before the board that where formerly on the lines of the Canadian Pacific in Western Canada, the coast rate was not made a maximum to intermediate points, the people travelling from such intermediate points did send to the coast to purchase tickets, and that in view of this practice the present method of making the coast rate a maximum developed. It certainly would appear that any passenger travelling with any degree of regularity would soon know how to take advantage of such an arrangement.

If, in the case of freight, a higher rate exists from an intermediate point to destination, the freight, in order to take advantage of the lower rate on a movement to Montreal, assuming, for example, that a lower rate existed from St. John to Montreal than from the intermediate point to the same destination, would have to move to St. John on the local rate and then move back westward through the intermediate point to Montreal. This is what actually did take place in the United States in the '70's of last century, where points such as Pittsburg moved goods east to the Atlantic coast in order to obtain the advantage of the Atlantic coast rates westbound. The situation at present in connection with the Panama canal presents a somewhat similar condition, although here there is a rail and water route as distinguished from the all-rail route. Goods are being moved from west of Chicago by rail to the Atlantic seaboard to take advantage of the water rate between the Atlantic seaboard and the Pacific coast.

In the case of passenger traffic, a roundabout movement such as freight may take in order to get the advantage of a lower rate is less common. The directness of the route, the time taken, and the incidental expenses of travelling attaching to the longer route are factors which exercise an influence on the passenger movement. But, as indicated, it is not necessary for the passenger to go in person to the ticket office at the longer distance point which has a competitive rate. The effect of competition at the longer distance point may thus be spread by the action of the passenger over the whole route between the two terminals affected by the competition, since it is open to the passenger to take advantage of the compelled rate instead of paying on mileage. The only limitation apparent is the checking of baggage. It does not appear, however, that this is a prohibitive factor.

The contention of the railway that as to the journey between St. John and Montreal there is a competitive situation throughout is well taken. There is an actual competition at the initial and at the terminal point, and the potential choice of the prospective passenger spreads the effect of competition over the whole journey.

Section 315 of the Railway Act prescribes that in respect of traffic of the same description, ". . . . . under substantially similar circumstances and conditions. . . . carried in or upon the like kind of cars passing over the same portion of the line of railway. . . . . " there shall be equality of charge.

Subsection 6 of section 315 does not arise in the present application, as it is concerned simply with the power of the board to declare that "any places are competitive points" within the meaning of the Railway Act. It has been laid down by the board in its decision in the Western Rates Case at p. 11:—

> "Subsections 5 and 6 are the long and short haul sections, the effect of which is to permit a reduced charge on movements to a competitive point, even although that reduced charge is smaller than the charge made for carriage for lesser distances along the same line to intermediate points. The subsections are sections which directly recognize the necessity, in proper cases, of operation at a reduced toll justified by competitive conditions. The result is, therefore that lesser tolls may be legal under such circumstances, and that a discrimination may exist between different localities without such discrimination amounting to an illegal practice."

It does not appear necessary to develop here the significance of the words as set out in the main section, viz., "passing over the same portion of the line of railway," or

the further words as set out in subsection 5 of the section, viz., " ..... in the same direction over the same line is greater for a shorter than for a longer distance, within which such shorter distance is included ....." The significance of these limitations has been dealt with in *Malkin & Sons* v. *Grand Trunk Ry. Co., 8 Can. Ry. Cas., pages 186 and 187;* see also *Almonte Knitting Co.* v. *Canadian Pacific and Michigan Central Ry. Cos., 3 Can. Ry. Cas., 441.*

The general scope of section 315 makes clear that the board is empowered to recognize the existence of competition and of its effects. The existence of competition is one factor creating dissimilar circumstances and conditions, and when the board is satisfied that such competition exists it may allow the lower toll in respect of the section in which the dissimilar circumstances and conditions so created exists.

In the former hearing, the decision on the point herein involved turned on the absence of competition at the intermediate point on the main line movement. Now, on further evidence and consideration thereof, the existence of pervasive competition on the main line movement is established. Consequently, the finding of the former judgment dealing with the point herein involved should be revised.

Chief Commissioner DRAYTON: In light of the fuller information now before the board, I am obliged to agree in dismissing the application of the Board of Trade of Fredericton. It is to be regretted that the record was not made complete in the first instance.

Reported in 17, Can. Ry. Cas. 433, 439.

APPLICATION OF THE CENTRAL CONVENTION OF FARMERS' INSTITUTES OF BRITISH COLUMBIA FOR THE PRIVILEGE OF SHIPPING MIXED CARLOADS OF FLOUR AND FEED (IN SACKS) AND BALED HAY AND STRAW AT CARLOAD RATES.

Judgment, Chief Commissioner DRAYTON, January 7, 1915:

This application was heard at Vancouver at a sitting held in October, 1913. The railway company was represented, but as no one appeared for the applicants, no action was taken, and the matter has subsequently been brought up by correspondence.

The applicants alleged that the refusal of the company so to bill mixed carloads of flour, feed and hay constitutes a hardship to the settlers, many of whom desire to purchase these commodities in wholesale quantities at a time when they could be procured at reasonable prices, and that as they cannot so purchase they are compelled to obtain supplies from retailers at much higher rates.

I am of the opinion that the application must be dismissed.

Less than a carload consignment of hay cannot be looked upon as a movement of commodities in wholesale quantities. Under the present classification hay moves with a minimum loading of but 20,000 pounds.

The Traffic Department has very carefully looked through the different tariffs and classifications applying in other places, and reports that no tariff or classification permits a carload mixture as asked; and that, on the other hand, under the present classification, hay and straw in carloads move under the 10th class at a minimum rate of 20,000 pounds per car, while flour and other mill stuffs in carloads take the 8th class at a minimum of 30,000 pounds.

In view of the low minimum applying on hay and the higher minimum as well as the higher rate which applies on flour and other mill stuffs, I am unable to see what advantage would accrue to the applicants at all compatible with the general disarrangement of the classification.

The classification west of lake Superior provides a number of distinctive headings covering groups of commodities which may be consolidated into carloads at carload rates; but under rule 2 (c), when the various articles in such mixtures, take different classification ratings if shipped separately in straight carloads, the entire mixed car-

load is charged the highest carload rate, and the highest minimum carload weight. This is practically the universal rule in freight classification.

If the application were granted it would have to be subject to this rule, unless the whole scheme of mixed classification is to be upset, so that the heavier articles, flour, etc., would have to make room for the lighter, hay and straw, without a corresponding reduction in the carload minimum weight, the result being that the rate on a car so mixed would be at the 8th class instead of at the lower 10th class rate, and would be accompanied by a minimum weight charge of 30,000 pounds.

So far I only treat the question as a matter of classification.

The company has, however, a special commodity tariff (C.R.C. No. W. 1686), which gives reduced rates on straight or mixed carloads of bagged flour, grain, flax-seed, oatmeal, and mill stuffs, with a minimum loading of 40,000 pounds, and also reduced rates on straight carloads of hay with a minimum weight of 24,000 pounds.

It is hard to say on what ground an extension of the mixing privilege could be ordered which would apply to the special rates under this tariff. As to the minimum per car, the differences in the present instance being 16,000 pounds as against 10,000 pounds the result is that if hay were consolidated in one car with grain, the loading would have to amount to 40,000 pounds, or else the shipper is paying for freight that does not move. This of itself alone would prohibit such a movement. While hay and straw are agricultural products just as much as grain and its products; they can hardly be considered as analogous commodities. The grain rate, for example, is accompanied by the special feature of milling and malting privileges in transit.

I am of the opinion that the application must be refused and that if granted it would be largely merely a matter of trouble to the railway companies with but little if any advantage to the shippers.

Concurred in by Commissioner McLean.

RE APPROACHES TO FARM CROSSINGS.

Judgment, Chief Commissioner DRAYTON, January 11, 1913:

The issue between the railway company and the owner of the farm, Mr. Colwill, is now narrowed down merely to the question of approach fences.

Under the provisions of Order No. 19146, the company was directed to construct a suitable farm crossing by way of bridge. The bridge has been constructed with the result that the approach at its maximum height is ten feet above the surface of the adjacent ground. An approach of such a character should be fenced. It is customary to fence them, and the company itself in dealing with similar farm crossings in the neighbourhood has fenced them. The farm owner has already carried his fence lines along the line of the approach to a point where the approach is 5 feet above the adjoining ground so that the whole question in dispute is merely as to whether or not the railway company, as part of the work, should connect that part of the approach already built by the owner to the bridge railing.

The work should be done by the company, and is necessary to be done in properly carrying out the terms of the Order.

Assistant Chief Commissioner Scott concurred.

COMPLAINT OF THE TAYLOR MILLING AND ELEVATOR COMPANY OF LETHBRIDGE, ALTA.

Judgment, Chief Commissioner DRAYTON, January 12, 1915:

The complaint relates to a rate on carloads of millstuffs from Lethbridge, Alberta, to Crawford Bay, British Columbia, the applicant company in its complaint stating:—

> "We figured that this station should be in the Nelson group, which takes a rate of 27 cents out of Lethbridge, being a through rate which applies from all points from Kootenay landing up as high as Kaslo."

The position taken by the company was that Crawford bay was not on the direct line of transit, being on an arm of the lake, and that the car had to be taken by barge to Proctor and transhipped at Proctor by steamer to Crawford bay.

Under these circumstances, the company claims that the only legal rate from Lethbridge was, therefore, the rate to Proctor and Nelson, namely 27 cents plus the local mileage, eighth class rate of 8 cents per 100 lbs. from Proctor, making a total of 35 cents.

The company's position was tenable in view of the fact that published traiffs did not contain any through rate to Crawford bay, under which circumstances the combination of the Proctor rate plus the local was the through rate called for by the tariffs filed.

On further consideration of the whole matter, it became apparent that, in the development of the principles laid down by the board in the so-called Western Rates case, a new tariff would have to be filed covering not only Crawford bay but the entire territory which should reasonably be considered in connection with the movement of millstuffs from Lethbridge.

A mileage tariff carrying out the principles of the Western Rates judgment has since been filed by the company, the tariff becoming effective on the first instant in lieu of the rates complained against from Lethbridge. This tariff is a mileage one, and as Crawford bay is shown on the company's official distance tables, it with other ports of call, takes the rates appropriate to its mileage, with the result that the rate complained of from Lethbridge to Crawford bay of 35 cents now becomes a rate of 23½ cents.

The new scale is not, of course, confined to Crawford bay. It is a scale which is just in its operation, based as it is on mileage, with the result that the rate to Nelson becomes 24 cents instead of the old 27-cent rate, while the rate to Proctor becomes 22½ cents and to Kaslo 24 cents.

Commissioner McLean concurred.

APPLICATION OF THE CITY OF CALGARY FOR AN ORDER COMPELLING THE CANADIAN NORTHERN RAILWAY COMPANY TO CARRY OUT THE TERMS OF AN AGREEMENT RESPECTING STREET-CROSSINGS IN THE CITY OF CALGARY.

Judgment, Assistant Chief Commissioner Scott, January 12, 1915:

The city of Calgary asks the board to decide whether certain land owners whose property is adjacent to certain crossings of the Canadian Northern Railway Company's tracks over highways in the city of Calgary should be entitled to damages.

By Order No. 14611, dated August 18, 1911, the board approved of the crossing of the tracks of the Canadian Northern Railway over Thistle, Pine, Spruce, Poplar, and Hungerford streets, in the city of Calgary. That order was made subject to the terms and conditions contained in a resolution passed by the council of the city of Calgary consenting to the crossing of the said streets. The resolution was passed on the 12th June, 1911. The portion of it with which we are now concerned is clause 6, which is as follows:—

> "That the C.N.R. undertake and enter into an agreement with the city to pay any and all property damages and to indemnify the city therefrom"

The plan approved by the board shows the profile of the crossings of the tracks on each of the highways above mentioned. At Spruce, Poplar and Hungerford streets the grade on the highway to the railway on each side is shown to be 5 per cent. On a blue print of the plan which we have on file the following endorsement is found:—

> "Approved subject to conditions as per report, June 10, 1911, Jno. W. Mitchell, Mayor of Calgary; W. D. Spence, Clerk."

The Report of June 10 is the report of the Railway Committee of the Municipal Council and was adopted by the resolution of June 12, 1911, already mentioned.

I have examined the crossings in question and I find that the railway crosses the highways in question on an embankment and that the grade at the track is considerably higher; say about eight or nine feet than the original grade of the highways.

In expropriating its right of way over the property adjoining the highways in question the railway has paid consequential damages to some of the land owners for damage to their adjoining property; but, there are a number of owners of property on the streets in question who may have suffered damage because of the close proximity of the railway; or, because of the change in the grade of the street in front of their property, who have received no compensation whatever because the railway did not actually take a portion of their property. The question now before us is whether these parties should be compensated, and if so, by whom.

At the time the board issued its order of the 18th August, 1911, approving of the crossings in question there was nothing before the board to show that the interests of any individuals would suffer; and, as already pointed out, the city was actually consenting to the order going.

More than a year after the consent of the city to the crossings in question was given and the order of the board was issued, an agreement between the city and the railway company was entered into on the 24th October, 1912, dealing with the entrance of the railway into the city. Clause 10 of that agreement bears on the matter before us and is as follows:—

> "The company hereby agrees to indemnify and save harmless the city from and against any and all manner of expense, costs, suits, claims and damages of any nature and kind whatsoever arising out of the location of the company's line along the said route or the construction of any of the works herein agreed to be constructed or the closing of any streets herein agreed to be closed, and that it will in all proceedings to determine any damages or other matter, at the request of the city as far as possible take upon itself the conduct of any suit or other proceedings and indemnify the city against all costs in connection therewith and pay the costs of the city's solicitor or counsel in suits or other proceedings, the conduct of which is not undertaken by the company. Provided, however, that the city shall notify the company of any claim made against the city, and that the company shall have the right to appear and be represented by counsel and take upon itself the conduct of any such proceedings on notice to the city."

At the sittings in Calgary we were told by counsel for the railway company that no claim had been made or referred to by the city to the railway company, and he submitted that if any claim was made it was a matter for the courts of the province and not this board to interpret the agreement in question.

At the time the crossings in question were approved of, the board had power under section 235 of the Railway Act as amended by section 6 of chapter 22 of the statutes of 1911, to require such compensation to adjacent or abutting landowners as the board deems proper at the crossing of a railway over a highway; but, I am not aware of any case similar to the present in which the board has exercised that power. I of course cannot say what might have been done at the time the order of August 18, 1911, was issued had no agreement between the city and the railway company been entered into, and had the question of damage to abutting landowners been brought to our attention.

Now, after the lapse of three years since we approved of the crossings in question, and with the agreement between the railway company and the city before us, I see no justification for this board interfering. The parties must be left to their rights, whatever they are under the agreement.

Another point which was brought before us was the lack of the railway company to provide approaches of a grade not exceeding 5 per cent at the crossings affected. The standard regulations of the board respecting highway crossings require the grade on approaches not to exceed 5 per cent, and the board has no hesitation in saying that if the grade on the approaches are steeper than 5 per cent that they should be made to conform with our standard requirements.

An order may go as to the grade on approaches, but no order is made on the question of damages.

Concurred in by Commissioner Goodeve.

APPLICATION OF THE BOARD OF TRADE OF CUMBERLAND, B.C., FOR INTERCHANGE TRACKS BETWEEN THE LINES OF THE CANADIAN COLLIERIES, LIMITED, AND THE ESQUIMALT AND NANAIMO RAILWAY COMPANY AT ROYSTON.

Judgment, Assistant Chief Commissioner SCOTT, January 14, 1915:

The Canadian Collieries, Limited, a company incorporated by the province of British Columbia, has a railway running from Cumberland to Union wharf. This railway crosses the line of the Esquimalt and Nanaimo Railway near a flag station on the latter railway called Royston. The crossing is about 4½ miles from Cumberland. There are no facilities at the diamond for the transhipment of passengers, express or freight. At present passengers get off at Royston and walk about 2,500 feet along a highway until they come to the Collieries railway where they can get a train for Cumberland. In October last one of the inspectors of the board reports that on one day there were as many as twenty-three passengers transferred from one line to the other; and from the evidence put in at the sittings in Victoria it is apparent that there would be considerable passenger travel between points on the E. and N. and Cumberland if this connection were put in, and proper facilities for the transfer of passengers and their baggage established.

The only way to get freight into Cumberland at present, either C. L. or L. C. L. is to have it go in over the Canadian Collieries line from Union wharf. This makes it difficult for Cumberland merchants to deal with wholesale houses in Victoria. Cumberland has a population of three or four thousand inhabitants with some industries, and the indications are that it will grow.

I think it in the public interest that there should be suitable facilities established near the crossing of these railways for the transfer of passengers, baggage, express and freight, both C. L. and L. C. L. The Canadian Collieries, Limited, is not under the jurisdiction of this board and we have no power to order it to pay a portion of the cost of this undertaking. Nevertheless, I think it should contribute a portion of the cost of the work to be done, and I believe that if the connection were put in it would prove to be beneficial to the Collieries line. The connection would, I believe, be more beneficial to the E. and N. Railway Company and I therefore think that company should contribute the larger portion of the cost. After consultation with the board's chief engineer and operating officer, I have come to the conclusion that a fair division of the cost would be: two-thirds to be paid by the Esquimalt and Nanaimo Railway and one-third by the Canadian Collieries, Limited. Both these officers agree that this will be a fair distribution of the cost.

Plans should be prepared by the E. and N. Railway Company to be submitted for the approval of the board, showing track connection and station facilities. Royston station building is on the wrong side of the track and therefore should be moved Probably expense could be saved if when moving the station to the other side of the track it were also moved nearer to the diamond so that the connecting line would be as short as possible. We will make an order requiring the Esquimalt and Nanaimo Railway Company to do the work on condition that the Canadian Collieries, Limited, con-

sent to assume one-third of the cost; or, is ordered to contribute that amount by some forum having jurisdiction over it. Neither railway company should receive anything for any portion of its land which it will be necessary for it to use in constructing the interchange. The plans of the proposed layout to be submitted by the Esquimalt and Nanaimo Railway Company should be sent to the board by the first of March next and copies of it supplied to the Canadian Collieries, Limited, and the British Columbia Government.

Concurred in by Commissioner Goodeve.

APPLICATION OF W. J. BOLAND, ON BEHALF OF MILLAR H. FINDLAY, TORONTO, FOR ORDER COMPELLING THE GRAND TRUNK RAILWAY COMPANY TO EXTEND RAILWAY SIDING CONSTRUCTED INTO PREMISES OF FAIRBANKS-MORSE CANADIAN COMPANY, LIMITED, INTO CERTAIN PROPERTY RECENTLY RENTED FOR FACTORY PURPOSES.

Judgment, Chief Commissioner DRAYTON, January 18, 1915:

This application was heard by the Assistant Chief Commissioner and Commissioner McLean at a sitting of the board held in Toronto, July 3, 1914.

My brother commissioners have asked me to consider the issues raised.

So far as the facts are concerned, the Assistant Chief Commissioner has made an inspection of the property. He has found that the Grand Trunk Railway line with which the siding connects is on the east side of the Fairbanks-Morse property; that the property of Mr. Boland, the applicant, is on the west side of the Fairbanks-Morse property; and that there is no other way of affording the Boland property railway facilities except by extending the existing Fairbanks-Morse siding.

As a result of his inspection he further found that, physically, it was quite feasible to build the siding; and that the Boland property is in an industrial section of Toronto, but is handicapped by the lack of railway facilities which would be necessary if the applicant's present intention of establishing a coal and wood yard on his property is to be carried out.

I entirely adopt these conclusions arrived at by the Assistant Chief Commissioner and consider only the question as to whether or not, under the circumstances of this case, the board should grant Mr. Boland that facility which, under ordinary circumstances, he would be entitled to.

The Fairbanks-Morse siding, which it is now sought to have extended, was authorized by Order of the Board No. 10,062. This order was made on the application of the Grand Trunk Railway Company and the consent of the Fairbanks-Morse Company, as evidenced by an agreement with the railway company dated December 31, 1909. The order authorized the construction of the siding subject to the terms and conditions contained in the agreement.

The siding constructed is about 1,600 feet in length, 155 feet of which is constructed on the right of way of the Grand Trunk and some 1,450 feet on what was at that time at any rate beyond all question the land of the Fairbanks-Morse Company. The siding branches out into three different tracks on the premises of the Fairbanks-Morse Company. It is proposed that the siding now applied for should be connected with the most westerly track at a point some 180 feet from its northerly extension. This westerly track lies 19 or 20 feet east of the easterly boundary line of the Boland property. It is physically perfectly possible to make the connection; but in order to do so on the necessary curve, the new construction, commencing at the point indicated, continues on the land of the Fairbanks-Morse Company for a distance of some 75 feet.

The Fairbanks-Morse Company states that the siding belongs to it, and that the board is without jurisdiction to order any extension of the siding or connection with it; and Mr. Cowan, who appeared for the Fairbanks-Morse Company, relies on the cases of Blackwoods *vs.* Canadian Northern Railway Company, 44 S.C.R. 92, and Clover Bar Coal Company *vs.* Humberstone, 45 S.C.R. 346.

These cases are distinguished by Mr. Macdonell, counsel for the applicant, on the ground that the decisions in both these cases dealt with sidings unauthorized by the board and which did not form part of the railways; while the siding in question being authorized by the appropriate order, under Section 222, became part of the railway.

Counsel further argues that that part of the judgment of Duff, J., in the Blackwoods case, where he deals with the question as to whether or not, the presumption arose that the requirements of section 222 had been observed, proceeding as the learned judge does on the assumption that the section had not been observed, that the judgment of the court would have been to the contrary if an order under the section had been made.

It is necessary that reference should be made to the agreement under which the siding was constructed.

In the agreement the railway is referred to as the Company and the Fairbanks-Morse Company as the Contractor. Paragraph 3 of the agreement is as follows:—

> "The Company will provide the rails, switches, frogs, fastenings and signals and all other iron or steel work required for the construction of the said siding, all of which shall remain the property of the Company."

Paragraph 5, after providing for a nominal rental of $1.00 per year on the value of the rails, switches, frogs, etc., to be paid by the Contractor, proceeds to deal with this rental as follows:

> "and as an acknowledgment of the Company's ownership and control of the said siding, which is hereby understood that company furnish for the accommodation of the business of the Contractor."

The agreement also provides that the Company is to supply the necessary signals, light them, and maintain and repair the siding, while all switches connecting the siding are to be under the sole control of the employees of the Company.

The Company also reserves the right to alter the position of the siding if necessary, for its purposes, i.e., the purposes of the railway.

Paragraph 16, dealing with the right of way, is as follows:—

> "The Contractor will secure to the Company the right of way over the lands on which any portion of the said siding may be constructed outside of the lands or property of the Company, and will save the Company harmless from all claims for compensation by the owners of the said lands, and will pay, and hold the Company harmless from all taxes of whatever kinds or nature (including those payable in respect of drainage, or for local improvements) which shall be assessed or levied by any authority, or for any purpose upon the lands used and occupied by and for the said right of way."

The agreement also provides that the Contractor is to protect the railway from cattle or other animals escaping thereupon from such portion of the siding as may be outside the railway lands.

The term of the agreement is 5 years, and the agreement is subject to cancellation at any time on three months notice by the Company.

On the expiration of the agreement, paragraph 19 provides that the Company shall have the right, without previous notice, to take up all the iron and steel work in the siding belonging to the Company, and that the right shall continue until the expiration of three months' notice from the Contractor to the Company directing the Company to take up and remove the rails and other material.

The agreement is on a printed form which contained paragraphs allowing the company to use the siding as a common carrier without any charge being made by the Contractor; also allowing it to receive and deliver freight upon the siding for persons other than the Contractor, if that can be done without interfering with the proper

handling of the business of the Contractor and subject to a payment per car therefor and a further provision under which the siding may be connected with or crossed by other sidings or used as an approach to or a continuation of any other siding. All these provisions are struck out.

As a result of the agreement then the siding is not a permanent construction but is constructed and operated for the business of the "Contractor" only and the necessary right of way remains the property of the Contractor. As the order relied on by the applicant as making the siding part of the railway on its face states that it is made "subject to the terms and conditions set forth in said agreement." I am at a loss to see, apart from all other considerations, how such a construction can be given to it. Apart from the order, the construction of that part of the siding on the lands of the Contractor could have been made without approval by the board.

It is said that any construction made under section 222 must be part of the railway. I have no doubt that the branch line sections do contemplate such branch lines being constructed as railway property and becoming part of the general railway undertaking. Section 222 contemplates the work being done by the company on a right of way which the company acquires in the same manner as the company's main line right of way is acquired; and the other section dealing with the construction of a somewhat different branch line (section 226)—a construction that is forced on the railway company—specially provides that, after the railway company has rebated the whole cost of the industry which has supplied the money for the building of the line, including the right of way, the branch becomes the absolute property of the railway company.

I am of the opinion that construction made under an order issued under the provisions of section 222, is not *ipso facto* railway property. Whatever the effect of such order might be as against the railway company, it cannot in any way affect the title of others and transfer the right of way on which the siding may be built from them to the railway. While it may well be that the section contemplates the acquisition of the right of way by the railway company, it can only contemplate this being done by agreement with the landowner or after payment of compensation fixed under the appropriate sections of the Act. Nothing of the sort has happened here.

To treat the siding as railway property and grant the application would work an unwarranted interference with the contractual rights of the Fairbanks-Morse Company, and take its property (i.e. the right of way) without compensation; a result, I am confident no enabling order under section 222 was ever contemplated to work.

Apart from the effect of an order under this section, the agreement is not as much in case of the board's jurisdiction as was the agreement in the Clover Bar case, under which agreement the railway company had the right to use the siding for the purpose of affording not only shipping facilities for itself but for other persons as well, with the express right, if necessary, to extend the siding for such an object; while in this case the similar provisions appearing in the agreement are deliberately struck out.

Under the circumstances of the case and in view of the facts found by the Assistant Chief Commissioner on his inspection, I am nevertheless of the view that an enabling order should go authorizing the Grand Trunk Railway Company to expropriate the right of way through the Fairbanks-Morse Company's property and to construct the siding which is asked.

While on the one hand no injury should be worked against merchants already having siding accommodation, on the other hand public interest demands that, in cases where sidings can be extended without injury, the interests of others requiring railway accommodation should not be disregarded.

Here, the argument has lapsed. The Fairbanks-Morse Company has no title in the superstructure which may at any time be removed. The cost to the Grand Trunk of the expropriation of the right of way should be covered in a proper charge made by the company in view of the expense to which the railway company is put, and divided between those using the siding on a *pro rata* basis.

It is to be hoped that, in view of the circumstances, no order authorizing the expropriation need be issued, but that an adjustment will be made between the parties. There is no doubt that arrangements can be made under which the Boland property can be served without injury to the interests of the Fairbanks-Morse Company. It would occur to me that a reasonable solution of the whole question would be for the applicant to pay the Fairbanks-Morse Company for the land required for the extension of the siding, and pay that company a rate per car for the use of the siding already constructed. If an arrangement is consummated and no expropriation of the siding as a whole had, it should also be made on a basis which will recognize the Fairbanks-Morse Company as having the first, and, therefore, a prior—although not exclusive—right, with the result that the siding would be so operated as to give the business of that company precedence. Of course, if expropriation is ultimately adopted, the rights of all industries which may have to use the siding, or any extension of it in the future, would be common.

Judgment, Assistant Chief Commissioner SCOTT, November 10, 1914:

The Fairbanks-Morse Canadian Company has a Grand Trunk Railway spur into its property on the south side of Bloor street, Toronto. This spur was authorized by an order of the board No. 10062, dated April 5, 1910. The order was issued on the application of the Grand Trunk Railway Company, under section 222 of the Railway Act. It was made subject to the terms and conditions of an agreement made between the railway company and the Fairbanks-Morse Company, dated December 31, 1909. Paragraph 5 of the agreement is as follows:—

> "The contractor (Fairbanks Company) shall pay to the (railway) company, beginning on the date when the charge therefor is first made on the books of the company after the completion of the said siding, one dollar per annum on the value of the rails, switches, frogs, fastenings, and signals and other iron and steel material of the company in the said siding, and as an acknowledgment of the company's ownership and control of the said siding which is hereby understood that the company furnishes for the accommodation of the business of the contractor."

The Grand Trunk Railway line with which the spur connects is on the east side of the Fairbanks property. The property of Boland the applicant is on the west side of the Fairbanks property. Boland, on behalf of Miller H. Findlay, applies to the board for a spur off the Fairbanks' spur into his property. There is no other way of supplying the Boland property with a railway spur than to have it run off of the Fairbanks-Morse spur.

Since the hearing, I have visited the Fairbanks-Morse property and examined the location of the spur on the ground. Physically it is quite feasible to build the spur applied for. The Boland property is in an industrial section of Toronto, but is, undoubtedly, handicapped by the lack of railway facilities. The applicant is desirous of establishing a coal and wood yard on his property.

The railway company do not offer any serious opposition to this application, but the Fairbanks-Morse company strongly object. I am satisfied of the necessity of the spur applied for in the interests of trade. I am also satisfied that the damage or inconvenience that the Fairbanks Company might suffer if this application is granted could be fairly compensated by the payment of an annual sum during the time that the Boland spur would be subject to be used. The Fairbanks-Morse Company in opposing the application contends that its spur is its own private property, and that the board has not jurisdiction to grant this application. I think the board has jurisdiction to order the construction of the spur applied for. The Fairbanks-Morse spur is not the private property of the Fairbanks Company, but is part of the Grand Trunk Railway. Being authorized by the board under section 222 of the Railway Act, it was constructed as part of the railway and is subject to the jurisdiction of this board, and is included

in the word "railway" in section 226 of the Act. It was acknowledged to be part of the Grand Trunk Railway in paragraph 5 of the agreement between the Fairbanks-Morse Company and the railway company, already quoted. In Blackwoods *v.* C.N.R., 44 Sup. Ct. p. 92, it was decided that a private spur constructed under an agreement, but not authorized by the board, could not be added to to provide railway facilities for another industry without the spur being expropriated, or the owner thereof compensated, as the board had no jurisdiction to make such an order. The present case is not the same as the Blackwoods case. In that case it was the Blackwoods private spur that the spur was to be built off. In the present case, it is part of the Grand Trunk Railway built to serve the Fairbanks-Morse Company that the applicant desires to use.

Another case which should be considered, but which like the Blackwoods case, does not apply to the present case is the Clover Bar Coal Company *v.* Humberstone and G.T.P. Ry., 45 Sup. Ct. p. 346. The spur in that case like the Blackwoods spur was private property and not part of the railway; the spur never having been authorized by the board. There was a clause in the agreement between the industry and the railway company which gave the railway company the right to use the spur for the purpose of affording shipping facilities for themselves and persons other than the owner of the land upon which the spur was built. The court decided that the board had no jurisdiction to make an order extending the spur to serve another industry. Anglin J. who delivered the judgment of a majority of the court, said: (pages 352-3.)

> "As pointed out in the case of Blackwoods, Limited, *v.* The Canadian Northern Railway Company—more particularly in the judgment of my brother Duff, at pages 96 *et seq.*—the appellants' spur, constructed solely under the authority of their agreement with the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway Company, must be treated as a private siding or branch, not in any sense part of the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway. Its connection with the railway, because lawful without authorization by the Board of Railway Commissioners, raises no presumption that such authorization was obtained. As a private siding the board, in my opinion, had not jurisdiction to order its extension, unless it first provided in a proper and legal manner for its becoming part of the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway. This it might have done by directing the expropriation by the railway company of the land on which the siding is constructed."

In the present case as the spur is already part of the railway, it is not necessary that any expropriation proceedings be taken; but, there should be compensation to the Fairbanks-Morse Company for the use of the railway through its property.

In order to inconvenience the Fairbanks-Morse Company as little as possible, the railway through its property should not be used to get to or from the Bolaud spur between the hours of 7 a.m. and 6 p.m.

An order may go accordingly.

Judgment, Mr. Commissioner McLean, January 14, 1915.—

The fundamental question involved in the present application is whether the spur is part of the railway. Order 10062 went subject to the terms and conditions of the agreement between the company, that is, the railway, and the contractor, that is, the Fairbanks-Morse Company. Section 5 of the agreement provides that "the contractor shall pay . . . . $1 per annum on the value of the rails, switches, frogs, fastenings and signals and other iron and steel materials of the company in the said siding, and as an acknowledgment of the company's ownership and control of the said siding which is hereby understood that the company furnish for the accommodation of the business of the contractor." Order 10062 went under section 222 of the Railway Act; but, in view of the fact that it went, as above indicated, subject to the terms and conditions set forth in the agreement, it is necessary to see just what the scope of the agreement was.

By section 19 of the agreement, it is set out that on the termination of the agreement, either by lapse of time or otherwise, or if there is any default in any of the covenants or obligations imposed upon the contractor, the railway shall have the right, without previous notice to the contractor, to take up all the "rails, switches, frogs, fastenings and signals, and iron and steel works and all other materials and property belonging to the company in the said siding." The railway did not, under the agreement, obtain any right of way. The Fairbanks-Morse Company, under the agreement, was to provide the necessary right of way. The effect of this is that the property in the physical materials necessary for the construction of the siding remained in the railway. The title to the right of way necessary for the siding outside of the company's lands remained in the Fairbanks-Morse Company.

In the ordinary printed siding agreement form used by the railway, section 8 provided that the railway was to have the right (1) to use the siding as a common carrier, without charge being made by the contractor (2) to receive and deliver freight upon the siding for persons other than the contractor, when this can be done without interfering with the proper handling of the business of the contractor, and subject to a payment per car therefor; (3) to connect the siding or cross the same with other sidings and use said siding as an approach to or continuation of any other siding. In the agreement between the railway and the Fairbanks-Morse Company, this section was stricken out.

While there is a reference in section 5 to "an acknowledgment of the company's ownership and control of the said siding," I cannot read this as incorporating the siding into the railway system, thereby making it part of the railway. The agreement is for a limited time. If the arrangment is continued thereafter, it would depend on another agreement. That is to say, assuming the force of the agreement is to incorporate the siding into the railway system, its continuance as a part thereof assumes as a condition precedent the continuing assent of the contractor. Further, under section 18 of the agreement, the company may terminate the agreement on three months' notice. It may also, under section 19, be terminated by it in case of default on the part of the contractor. On the termination of the agreement and the removal of the rails and materials, what ownership and control remains to the railway? While the siding is in operation under the agreement, it has an easement over the lands of the Fairbanks-Morse Company, this easement terminates when the agreement terminates.

The acknowledgment in section 5 as to "ownership and control" must be read along with the words "which is hereby understood that the company furnish for the accommodation of the business of the contractor." If the portion of track in question is part of the railway system, then it cannot be limited to the case of a particular individual. The wording of section 5 must be read in the light of the fact that section 8 is stricken out. It is evident that it was intended to preclude the siding being used for the business of any person other than the contractor. The words, in section 5, "which is hereby understood that the company furnish for the accommodation of the business of the contractor" are, therefore, to be read not as words of description but of limitation as to the use. That is to say, the company bound itself that this siding should be treated exclusively as a private siding. I am, therefore, unable to see that, on what is before us, the present application is distinguishable from the position laid down by the Supreme Court in its judgment in the Clover Bar Coal Company's case.

APPLICATION OF THE MUNICIPALITY OF ESQUIMALT FOR STATION FACILITIES ON THE ESQUIMALT AND NANAIMO RAILWAY AT THE CROSSING OF ADMIRAL'S ROAD.

Judgment, Assistant Chief Commissioner SCOTT, January 20, 1915:—

The Municipality of Esquimalt adjoins the city of Victoria on the west. It has a population of about 4,500 people and is a separate municipal organization from

Victoria. There are about 500 dwellings in Esquimalt. It is a naval and military base, and a shipbuilding industry has been located there. Esquimalt & Nanaimo Railway Company has no passenger facilities in Esquimalt. The municipality applies for both passenger and freight accommodation near the crossing of the railway over Admirals road, which would be the most convenient spot for the people of Esquimalt who wish to avail themselves of the service of the railway. The railway has a station called Esquimalt station which is some distance north of the northern boundary of the municipality; but, as there is no highway leading to that station, and because of its distance away it is of no benefit to the applicants. Esquimalt station is used merely by the railway company as a suitable place for it to get its oil for its engines; the oil being transferred from steamers at the railway company's wharf adjoining the station.

In Victoria, in addition to the terminus of the railway, it has a station called Russell station to the west of the bridge over Victoria Arm, where I understand all passenger trains now stop for the purpose of changing engines. Russell station is a little over a mile and three-quarters from the crossings of Admirals road. It seems to me unreasonable to expect the people of Esquimalt to travel into Victoria to take the train at the Victoria terminals, or Russell station, when it would be far more convenient for them to get the train at Admirals road.

After the hearing, I went over the ground and viewed the different points which might be suitable for a station for the Esquimalt people, and I also travelled up and down the line on the railway. I am satisfied that the Admirals road site is the most suitable, and I think that the people of Esquimalt are entitled to some railway facilities at that point.

As far as passenger facilities are concerned, I think there should be a flag stop at Admirals road for all passenger trains. Those desiring to take a passenger train at that point should have the train stop for them upon flagging it; and, those on a train desiring to leave it at Admirals road should have the train stopped for them upon the conductor being notified. There should be a flag station shelter erected at a convenient point in the vicinity of the Admirals road crossing. The railway company should submit to the board a plan of the proposed shelter and location within thirty days.

As far as freight facilities are concerned, the railway company has signified its willingness to put in a siding at Admirals road on the usual terms. The parties who desire the siding should negotiate with the railway company and endeavour to arrange for the facilities required. If they are unable to come to terms the matter may be referred to the board and it will be disposed of without further hearing. In the meantime, therefore, the question of freight facilities is reserved.

Commissioner Goodeve concurred.

STANDARD REGULATIONS *re* OPENING OF NEW LINES.

Judgment, Chief Commissioner DRAYTON, January 21, 1915.

The different railway companies were required to show cause why the standard regulations of the board as to the opening of new lines should not be changed so as to provide that, in addition to filing the standard mileage tariff applicable to traffic on the portion of the railway to be opened, the appropriate class or town tariffs, the mileage commodity tariffs, and the special tariffs on grain to Fort William, etc., and on lumber from British Columbia, should also be filed.

Notice was given the companies and the question considered at a hearing of the board held at Ottawa on January 5, 1915.

No sufficient reason was advanced by counsel appearing for the different railway companies against the proposed changes; but at the request of Mr. Flintoft, who appeared for the Canadian Pacific Railway Company, judgment was not delivered at

the hearing, but was withheld for ten days in order to allow Mr. Flintoft opportunity in which to file any written submissions he might desire to file on the receipt of further instructions.

No submissions have been filed either on behalf of the Canadian Pacific Railway Company or anybody else.

As announced at the hearing, the order will, therefore, go.

This action is necessary owing to the fact that cases have occurred in the past where it has been shown that, although railway companies before opening new lines have either filed standard mileage tariffs applicable to the extensions opened, or already have sufficient mileage to cover the extensions expressed in their existing tariffs, the companies have delayed in filing commodity rates, with the result that, in certain instances, shippers on the new lines suffer from a direct discrimination. To illustrate, the Canadian Pacific Railway from Assiniboia to Lefleche and Shaunavon was opened for traffic on January 19, 1914, the requirements of the board as to standard mileage tariffs being properly complied with. The reduced and usual lumber rates from British Columbia, however, were not filed with the board and did not come into effect until May 5, 1914, with the result that traffic moving over the new portion of the line was carried at rates unduly high and discriminatory. As a matter of fact a complaint shows that the difference in the rate from Ymir, B.C., to Lafleche was 4 cents, and from Ymir to Shaunavon 10 cents per 100 pounds. As a usual rule shippers in the first instance are not alive to the situation and the discrimination is practised for some little time, when complaints are inevitably received and the cause of the discrimination removed. As the standard mileage tariff, under which the commodity moved, was, nevertheless the only tariff applicable, the shippers have no opportunity to obtain refunds. Under this judgment, the rules of the board appertaining to the opening of new lines will be altered, so as to provide that not only must the standard mileage tariff applicable to traffic on the portion opened be effective, but that also the appropriate class or "town" tariffs, the mileage commodity tariffs, and the special tariffs on grain to Fort William, etc., and on lumber from British Columbia, be made effective. This arrangement will protect the public from overcharge without injury to the companies. It will simply mean that the internal arrangements of the companies must be somewhat changed, and that it will become the duty of the constructing department to advise the traffic department as to the approximate time roads under construction will be ready for opening, which will enable the preparation of proper tariffs to be made in proper time and obviate any delays that otherwise might occur.

This disposition of the matter does not, of course, affect emergency operations that are contemplated by section 261, subsection 7. There is undoubtedly a period when the road is not yet in a position to fulfil the statutory requirements of a carrier, while at the same time it is able to carry some traffic in case of settlers, who before railway extensions are made are often subject to almost prohibitive teaming costs. Note western freight rates judgment, pages 24 to 26 inclusive.

In the past companies at the urgent request of shippers have, through their construction departments, carried freight at any rate they chose to charge. These rates while excessive as compared with railway rates were nevertheless always less than those of the previous methods of transportation, and were sought to be justified on the grounds of the necessity of settlers, and the fact that such a service was in any event never remunerative to the carrier and to some extent a nuisance as interfering with construction work. The practice, however, was and is illegal. (Baker Reynolds Co. *v.* Canadian Pacific Railway Co., 10, C.R.C. 151 Randall *et al. v.* Canadian Pacific Railway Co. File 24292.)

In cases where the needs of a district demand it, in the future, orders may be made under the subsection for such a limited period as will enable the line to be brought to a proper state for general traffic.

In dealing with such applications in the future, while it is clear that the railways cannot be compelled to make the application, some action must be taken by the board having regard to the necessities of the emergency justifying leave to operate; which will limit the toll the railway company may collect.

Deputy Chief Commissioner Nantel and Commissioners McLean and Goodeve concurred.

PROTECTION AT SEVENTEENTH AVENUE, MOOSEJAW, SASK.

Judgment, Assistant Chief Commissioner SCOTT, January 22, 1915:

A number of residents of the city and district of Moosejaw have petitioned the board for a subway to carry Seventeenth avenue under the tracks of the Canadian Pacific Railway at Moosejaw. Seventeenth avenue is the main highway for those living south and east of Moosejaw to reach the city. The Saskatchewan college is on Seventeenth avenue south of the tracks of the railway; and, persons going to and from the business and chief residential sections of Moosejaw and the college must cross the tracks of the railway. The railway is on an embankment in the neighbourhood of Seventeenth avenue. This circumstance adds to the feasibility of a subway.

After the hearing at Moosejaw I visited the crossing in question and looked over the surrounding territory. The ground upon which the college is situated south of the tracks is higher than the railway; and approaching the tracks from the south on Seventeenth avenue a slight grade is descended. There is a curve on the railway to the east. With the exception of the view a person approaching the crossing from the south gets of a train coming from the east, which is somewhat obstructed, there is a good view in all directions of approaching trains.

As intimated to the parties at the hearing at Moosejaw, the board does not feel warranted at present in ordering the construction of a subway; but, when the population of the southeast section increases as is expected, and the financial position of the city of Moosejaw and the railway improves, the necessity will arise for a subway in the vicinity of Seventeenth avenue. It seemed to me that in the neighbourhood of Sixteenth avenue where the embankment is higher, the subway could be built for less money than at Seventeenth avenue. The city estimates a subway at Sixteenth avenue would cost $100,000, and at Seventeenth avenue $152,000. These are merely estimates. No detail plans have been prepared by the city. I do not know what size subway these estimates cover; but it seems to me a subway of sufficient size to take care of the traffic for many years to come could be built for less money at either of the avenues in question.

The question of whether a subway should, or should not be constructed in that locality can, therefore, be allowed to remain in abeyance until circumstances seem to warrant the matter being again brought to the attention of the board.

In order to decide what, if any, protection should be provided at the level crossing of Seventeenth avenue, we asked the city and the railway to supply us with statements of the travel on the railway and the highway. The railway company put in a statement to show that for the seven days from the 13th to the 19th December inclusive, there were 191 engine movements over the crossing. This is an average of about 29 movements in a day. The city puts in a statement which shows that from noon on December 15 to noon on December 22, between the hours from 6 a.m. and midnight there were 871 vehicles, including 128 automobiles passed over the crossing. This gives a daily average of 124. The same statement shows that 1,071 pedestrians crossed the track during that time, which means a daily average of 157. It is pointed out in a letter to the board by one of the petitioners that many persons travelling on foot between the city and the college take a short cut and cross the track at a point near Sixteenth avenue and they therefore were not counted in the number of pedestrians.

statement of which was sent in by the city. It is also pointed out that during the time that the count was being taken by the city, the weather, was extremely cold; the thermometer registering considerably below zero during almost the entire period.

I think under the circumstances, we may let this matter stand for six months and allow the city or the petitioners to again bring it to the attention of the board, if they desire to do so, with any further evidence they desire to submit.

Commissioner Goodeve concurred.

APPLICATION OF THE BOARD OF TRADE OF MOOSEJAW, SASK., FOR AN ORDER DIRECTING THE CANADIAN NORTHERN AND CANADIAN PACIFIC RAILWAY COMPANIES TO ESTABLISH A TRANSFER TRACK AT ROSETOWN, SASK.

Judgment, Mr. Commissioner GOODEVE, January 29, 1915:

This matter was first brought to the attention of the board by an application from the Prince Albert Lumber Company, Limited, on behalf of the Spruce Manufacturers, for an order directing the Canadian Northern Railway Company, or the Canadian Pacific Railway Company, to establish a switch connection at Rosetown or Conquest, and to issue joint rates on lumber via that transfer. It was first heard at Prince Albert on the 16th November, 1912, before the Chief Commissioner and Commissioner McLean, when copy of the application was ordered to be sent the railway companies with a request to file their answer. It was again heard at Winnipeg on December 16, 1912. At this hearing, by consent of the two companies interested, it was agreed to construct a transfer at Conquest in the spring as soon as the weather would permit, this having been decided upon as being the more suitable point. No formal order to go. The companies to file joint tariffs.

A letter of complaint, regarding the delay of the putting in of this transfer track was received from the Prince Albert Lumber Company, Limited, under date of January 22, 1913, to which reply was sent by the Chief Commissioner stating that owing to the undertaking of Mr. Lanigan on behalf of the C.P.R. Co., to have this transfer in by the 15th June next, the board did not deem it necessary to issue a formal order, and a further letter was forwarded to the C.P.R. Co. calling attention to this delay; the result of the correspondence being that Order No. 18682 was issued under date of February 14, 1913, ordering the construction of this transfer track at Conquest between the Canadian Pacific and Canadian Northern Railway Companies; work to be done by the Canadian Pacific Railway Company and to be completed by November 1, 1913. At a subsequent sitting in Regina on May 29, the time was extended for the completion of this work until June 15; and on July 25 the board received word that the transfer track was ready for service.

In March, 1913, a letter was received from the president of the Rosetown Board of Trade asking what steps were necessary relative to making a formal application for a transfer track at that point. The matter was taken up with the railway companies, and subsequently set down for hearing at Regina on Monday, May 26, 1913, the Board of Trade at Rosetown being represented by Mr. C. W. Holmes and Mr. F. W. Van Allen; Mr. O. H. Clark, K.C., appearing for the Canadian Northern Railway Company, and Mr. Sullivan for the Canadian Pacific Railway Company. After due consideration of all the evidence submitted, this application was refused.

On October 20, 1914, the matter was again brought to the attention of the board, by a letter from Mr. R. Patton, secretary of the Moosejaw Board of Trade, and under the direction of the Chief Commissioner it was set down for hearing at Moosejaw on December 10, 1914, when all parties interested were notified. The reason advanced for the asking of the re-opening of this case was that a new tariff had developed between the Canadian Northern and Canadian Pacific Railway Companies, which could move to greater advantage via Rosetown, consisting chiefly of grain, live stock and coal,

From the evidence submitted it was shown that the grain would move in this way under abnormal conditions only; and a statement was made by Mr. Stevens on behalf of the Canadian Northern Railway Company, that so far as live stock shipped via Moosejaw was concerned, between January and November, 1914, they had given to the Canadian Pacific Railway Company fifteen cars only, two of which might have been transferred via Rosetown to better advantage than via Conquest. He also put in statements showing carloads delivered by the Canadian Northern to the Canadian Pacific Railway Company for the same months; out of a total of 173 cars, 96 might have moved to better advantage via Rosetown; but two-thirds of this latter number consisted of coal for Moosejaw.

The movement of coal from Drumheller on the C.N.R. via the C.P.R. is only temporary, because when the C.N.R. Co.'s line from Regina to Moosejaw is completed no coal will be given the C.P.R. He also submitted a statement showing carloads of freight delivered from the C.P.R. Co., during the same months to the C.N.R. Co. Of this a total of 113 cars 71·6 per cent moved to their destination to the best advantage via Conquest, so that it is evident that the traffic chiefly concerned is coal, and this traffic is largely confined to the output of the Drumheller mines; and as stated above none of this traffic will go via C.P.R. when the C.N.R. Regina-Moosejaw branch is completed.

Taking present conditions, the C.N.R. distance Drumheller to Rosetown is 243·1 miles, to Conquest 318·1; C.P.R. Rosetown to Moosejaw 163·3, from Conquest 128·7; so that the through mileage via Rosetown, if the transfer were put in, would be 406·4, while via Conquest it is 446·8 miles.

Via Conquest the coal rate is $3.00 per ton; via Rosetown it would be $2.80—a difference of only 20 cents a ton.

It was shown that the cost of installing a transfer would be in the neighbourhood of $2,500, besides which as Rosetown is nearly three miles from the C.P.R. and about the same distance from the C.N.R. it would be necessary to appoint an agent to take charge of the transfer at that point, which would involve an additonal cost of six or seven hundred dollars or more per annum.

This is not the only source of supply of coal for Moosejaw and that district, and no evidence was submitted to show that there would be any advantage to the general public in the way of reduction of cost of coal if this transfer was installed. In fact, I am of the opinion that the Drumheller Mines and its agents would be the ones to whom any advantage would be likely to accrue.

Under these circumstances, I do not think we would be justified in putting upon the railways the cost of the installation of a transfer at this point; but in view of the oral judgment of the chief commissioner delivered in the Stettler case, heard at Calgary on June 22, 1914 (file 15800), I think a similar disposition might be made of this case, as I believe the conditions are parallel, namely, that this should be treated as an industrial spur and an order issued for the construction of the transfer on condition that the Drumheller Company deposit in a chartered bank the sum necessary to cover the cost of construction, which amount is to be rebated to the mining company at the rate of $2 per car until the money advanced for the construction of the spur is all refunded.

Assistant Chief Commissioner Scott concurred.

APPLICATION OF THE WOLFVILLE MILLING COMPANY, LIMITED, FOR THE BOARD'S RULING AS TO WHETHER THAT COMPANY OR THE DOMINION ATLANTIC RAILWAY COMPANY IS LIABLE FOR THE MAINTENANCE OF THE SPUR SERVING THE PROPERTY OF THE WOLFVILLE MILLING COMPANY.

Judgment, Chief Commissioner DRAYTON, February 1, 1915.

The complaint of the applicant company has been served on the railway company, which has now answered it.

On the applicant company being required to produce the agreement under which the siding was constructed it states that it has no record showing that any agreement had been entered into as to the up-keep of the siding at the time of construction.

The applicant company's submission further shows that the siding was built about fifteen years ago for the purposes of a previous owner of the mill; that the owner paid for the sleepers and the company supplied the rails; and that the company has kept the siding in repair with the exception of the trestle at the side of the mill.

The railway company's answer practically agrees with this statement of fact pointing out that the siding was built in the spring of 1898 for A. L. Calhoun (deceased), from whom the applicant company bought the siding; that Calhoun provided the ties in the first instance, and that the railway company graded the siding, put down the rails, and did the ballasting, and has since maintained it. The railway company also states that there was no agreement as to the siding.

As matters now stand, that part of the siding which is constructed on the railway company's right-of-way belongs entirely to the railway company. So far as the siding on the property of the applicant company is concerned, the title to the right-of-way is in the applicant company, the only interest the railway company has in the siding off its property being the ownership of the rails. Of course, if the siding had been constructed so that it would become part of the railway property, the railway company should be at the expense of repairing and maintaining the whole of it. Under the circumstances here, the railway company must maintain in its entirety that part of the siding which is built upon its own property.

So far as the extension of the siding into the property of the applicant company is concerned, the railway company should also, from time to time as necessity arises, renew the rails; but the understructure, including trestles or any other works that may be necessary to be maintained on the lands of the applicant company, should be maintained and repaired by it.

Assistant Chief Commissioner Scott concurred.

APPLICATION OF THE FORT WILLIAM BOARD OF TRADE TO BE GRANTED A REDUCTION OF 2½ CENTS PER 100 POUNDS, IN RATES, FOR SHIPMENTS WESTWARD ORIGINATING AT FORT WILLIAM.

Judgment, Assistant Chief Commissioner SCOTT, February 4, 1915.

There is a wharfage charge of 2½ cents per 100 pounds imposed by the Canadian Pacific Railway Company for the use of its wharf and warehouse at Fort William on shipments to Fort William for local delivery. This wharfage charge is not made by the railway company on through lake and rail shipments to points west of Fort William. It is contended by the Fort William Board of Trade that the rates from Fort William west, which are the same for shipments ex-lakes and shipments originating at Fort William, include this wharfage charge. The applicant contends that Fort William merchants who get in goods by water, pay the wharfage charge, and subsequently ship the same goods west from Fort William, pay the wharfage charge twice, i.e., 2½ cents per 100 pounds wharfage when the goods are received and the 2½ cents which it contends is included in the rail rate west.

The board of trade asks that an additional 2½ cents per 100 pounds be imposed on all through shipments to the West ex-lakes; or, that a rebate of 2½ cents per 100 pounds be granted on all west-bound shipments originating in Fort William.

The point at issue in this matter is, whether the rates on shipments from Fort William west, either ex-lake or originating at Fort William, include 2½ cents per 100 pounds to cover wharfage at Fort William or not. I have no hesitation in saying that the rates from Fort William west do not include anything for wharfage. These

rates were fixed by the board in General Order No. 125, and became effective on September 1, last. The order was issued pursuant to the judgment of the board in the western freight rates investigation. The special class rates from Fort William to points west, which will be found on page 63 of the printed judgment of the Chief Commissioner, are the rates on which the great bulk of traffic from Fort William moves west. These special class rates were prepared by the chief traffic officer of the board and bear a definite relation to the distributing and standard tariffs applicable to and from all points throughout the West. One might just as well contend that the rates from Winnipeg to Prince Albert, or from Saskatoon to Medicine Hat, include wharfage, as to say that the rates from Fort William west include that wharfage. Since the first of September last, all rates between points west of Fort William are fixed on a mileage basis, and if the request of the Fort William board of trade in this matter were made effective an unfair preference would be granted to Fort William, and some of the benefits of the board's order in the western freight rates investigation destroyed.

It is not unreasonable that the combined rates on goods from the East, contracted to Fort William, delivered and stored there, and subsequently reshipped west, should exceed those charged from the same eastern shipping point to the same western destination, for the transhipping of which the railway company must necessarily provide facilities at Fort William—in the latter case there is but one transaction or contract, in the former there are two.

At the hearing a shipment of potatoes was mentioned. A carload of potatoes grown in the vicinity of Fort William would be at no disadvantage as far as the rail rate was concerned, in competition with a carload shipped by lake and rail from the east.

It is, of course, true, that shipments to Fort William pay a wharfage charge, and that on through shipments this charge is not exacted. That is not a discrimination against Fort William and I think its board of trade has no ground for complaint.

The application should be refused.

Commissioner Goodeve concurred.

COMPLAINT OF THE BOARD OF TRADE OF FORT WILLIAM, AGAINST SWITCHING CHARGES AT FORT WILLIAM, ONT.

Judgment, Assistant Chief Commissioner SCOTT, February 4, 1915:

By its Tariff C.R.C.W. 1919, the Canadian Pacific Railway Company charges 1 cent per 100 pounds minimum $5 per car, for switching between its dock and railway sidings at Fort William. The same tariff also provides a similar charge at Port Arthur.

The Canadian Pacific Railway Company has extensive wharfage facilities at Fort William. In addition to its own line of steamers there are a number of steamship lines over which the Canadian Pacific Railway has no control, which use these Canadian Pacific Railway wharfage facilities. There is a city wharf at Fort William which is practically unused. All the water borne traffic destined for Fort William and places west is handled over the Canadian Pacific Railway wharf and through its warehouse.

A wharfage charge of 2½ cents per 100 pounds is imposed by the Canadian Pacific Railway on all water borne traffic for local delivery at Fort William unloaded at the Canadian Pacific Railway wharf whether it is carried on Canadian Pacific Railway or other boats. This charge covers the service for taking the traffic from the rail of the vessel and passing it through its warehouse to be loaded on cars for private siding or team track delivery, or to be teamed direct from the company's warehouse. The company has excellent wharfage and warehousing facilities at Fort William; and, while at our recent visit we found the facilities for teaming from the warehouse to points in Fort William were not as adequate as they might have been, we received the under-

taking of the company to supply adequate facilities for this purpose within a reasonable time. The question of the freight shed facilities at Fort William is dealt with in our File No. 24808, and my judgment in that matter at our sittings at Fort William, on December 16 last, will be found at page 6472 of volume 214 of the notes of evidence of the board.

The reasonableness of the 2½ cents per 100 pounds wharfage charge came up for discussion during the hearing, although no formal complaint against the wharfage charge had been made by the board of trade. This wharfage charge was stated to be the usual charge made for such service at United States ports on Lake Superior. The railway company has spent a large sum of money in providing the wharf and warehouse at Fort William and it is only reasonable that it should get a fair return for the use of its property. From the evidence before us I think the 2½ cent charge is a reasonable one.

At one time, before the railway company had its present wharf and warehousing facilities it used to load into cars and switch Fort William freight from its wharf to private sidings or team tracks in Fort William without charge. It is stated that this was done to relieve the congestion in the warehouse. Now, that its warehousing facilities have been increased the company states that congestion does not occur, and that therefore it feels justified in charging for such switching service if it is required.

Those receiving freight shipped to Fort William by water are not bound to pay for this switching service. They have the option of teaming their goods away from the freight shed, or of calling upon the railway company to switch the goods to the place where they desire to unload.

This switching service consists in the placing of an empty car, at the warehouse, loading it, and switching it through the expensive yards of the company at Fort William to the point designated by the consignee. For this service the company charges 1 cent per 100 pounds with a carload minimum of $5. This is the same rate as is fixed by the board for interswitching, with the exception that the carload minimum in interswitching is $3; and, for the switching under consideration it is $5.

There is a greater service provided in the case before us than in interswitching, because in interswitching the company that does the work merely takes a loaded car from one point to another—a distance not exceeding 4 miles; whereas, in the Fort William case the company must place its empty car, load it, and then switch it to destination. Under the circumstances, I do not think the existing switching charge at Fort William is excessive.

It was pointed out that where the consignee of goods ordered them to be switched to a point in Fort William, that he had to pay not only the 2½ cent wharfage, but also 1 cent switching; and, that the operation of taking the goods from the rail of the boat and placing them on the car to be switched was but one movement, and that as the two services charged for were rendered at the same time and to some extent were merged into one service that the combined charges were excessive. As I have already stated, I think each of these charges taken by themselves is reasonable; and, while it is true that the handling from the boat to the car is sometimes done as one movement, still the handling is only a portion of each of the services provided, and would not warrant any reduction in the rates being made.

I think this application should be refused.

Commissioner Goodeve concurred.

APPLICATION LONDON RAILWAY COMMISSION, ON BEHALF OF THE LONDON AND PORT STANLEY RAILWAY COMPANY, FOR APPROVAL OF CLEARANCES.

Judgment, Chief Commissioner DRAYTON, February 5, 1915:—

An application has been made by the London Railway Commission, acting for and on behalf of the London and Port Stanley Railway Company, for approval of certain railway clearances that are within the clearance ordered by the board.

The London and Port Stanley Railway Company, a Dominion incorporation, and, therefore, subject to the jurisdiction of the board, is now being operated by the London Railway Commission as agents for the corporation of the city of London, the lessees of the railway, under the provisions of 4-5 George V, C. 96.

The line is of some twenty-four miles in length, and is now being electrified, the work being carried out for the London commission by the Hydro-Electric Power Commission of Ontario.

The applicants, unfortunately, have proceeded with this work irrespective of the board's requirement as to clearances.

It is stated that the applicants had no knowledge of the board's requirements; and that, before commencing the work, believing that the clearances ordered by the board applied only to steam lines and not to electric roads, made an examination of some standard railways in the United States with a view of obtaining first-hand information of the best and most modern forms of construction, having particular regard—among other things—to the question of clearance.

The result of the investigation which the applicants made was to ascertain that the standard clearance required by American Electric Railway Engineering Associations' practice called for a clearance of seven feet, and the commission has proceeded with the work of electrification so as to give a clearance of seven feet 3 inches, thus giving three inches more clearance than required by the American practice.

The contract for all the poles has been given. These poles have been constructed so as to carry a cross-arm giving the clearance decided on, namely, seven feet three inches. Some one hundred and fifty poles have beeen actually erected. The erection is of a permanent, solid character, the poles being imbedded in concrete footings. The concrete block in which they are placed weighs from six thousand to seven thousand pounds. Unfortunately, not only have these poles been erected, but all the poles manufactured so as to provide a factor of safety which I would not regard as sufficient to insure public safety should the pole be used with new, longer, and heavier cross-arms, which would in all instances secure the required clearance of eight feet, four and a quarter inches.

In support of its application for the allowance of a reduced clearance, the London Railway Commission points out that, in the case of the electrified line, the overhead structure has to support a load varying from eight hundred to one thousand pounds per point normally throughout the length of the line; and that the cost of the overhead structure increases rapidly when the bracket is extended. It submits that this is the reason why the reduced clearance is allowed in the electrified road under American practice as against the clearance of seven feet, six inches, applying on standard steam railways.

The applicants also point out that the clearances of the Windsor, Essex and Lake Shore—a company under the jurisdiction of this commission—are but seven feet, while the clearances of the Hamilton and Dundas line are only six feet to six feet ten inches. This latter line is a provincial incorporation. The applicants also urge that, in order to get the board's clearance, not only would the poles be lost, but that the position of the track would have to be changed and a quantity of extra filling would have to be done along the line of the railway.

The applicants urge that, in so far as electrical construction is concerned, the standard of the Ontario Railway and Municipal Board should be adopted, which standard is quoted by the applicants as requiring—in the case of electric lines—a clear width of at least six and one-half feet on either side of the centre of the track at a height of ten feet above the rails.

The clearances adopted by the Ontario Railway and Municipal Board have really been made to cover the exigencies of the operation of electric, street, and radial cars. The clearances required by this board, on the other hand, are such clearances that will enable brakesmen to attend to their duties without running the danger of being struck

by poles or other erections near the track, and, in my view, the clearance demanded by the board—under its more recent regulation—of eight feet, four and a quarter inches, is not extreme and should be followed.

The applicants, however, point out that the poles are erected on one side of the line, and that their operating rules can be so drawn that the brakesmen or other members of the train crew will be required to get on and off cars on the side away from the poles, and that the railway can be run safely and efficiently without the brakeman being put in any position of danger whatever.

Orders in the past have been made by the board allowing clearance less than required in certain cases where the railway applying undertakes to keep its men off the sides of cars. These orders have generally been made for short distances and in cases where there is no necessity for the brakeman to use the side of the car. Here, the distance is long, but, on the other hand, the danger only existing on the one side, the other side could always be used.

I think, therefore, that an Order can go approving the clearances as to the one hundred and fifty poles already erected at seven feet, three inches. So far as the poles that are not erected are concerned, in the view of our engineers it will be safe to subject the poles to the additional strain involved by putting the wire three inches farther away from the pole. A clearance of seven feet, six inches, should, therefore, be permitted in the case of the unerected poles. The order would go in the usual form in such cases; that is, an order that is subject to the due performance of the undertaking of the company—in this case the commission—to keep its men off the side of the cars, on the side of the track on which the poles are erected.

The result is that, if the stipuation is not observed, and the lives of the operators are placed in jeopardy as a result, the benefits of the order reducing the clearance cease, and the construction will be subject to being moved to the clearance of eight feet, four and a quarter inches as called for by the present general order of the board.

Commissioner McLean concurred.

APPLICATION OF THE LACHINE, JACQUES-CARTIER & MAISONNEUVE RAILWAY COMPANY, UNDER SECTION 157 OF THE RAILWAY ACT, FOR APPROVAL OF LOCATION FROM A POINT ON ST. CATHERINE STREET, MONTREAL, QUEBEC, EXTENDING NORTHWESTERLY A DISTANCE OF 7.18 MILES, TO CONNECTION WITH THE GRAND TRUNK RAILWAY NEAR JACQUES-CARTIER JUNCTION.

Judgment Chief Commissioner DRAYTON, February 5, 1915.

The railway company's route map having been approved by the Minister of Railways under the Act, the location plan was filed and approved by the board.

The location approved crossed the lands of the Montreal Street Railway Company now in question. The formal order of approval (being Order No. 13993), contained the following provision:

> "(d) The location across the lands of the Montreal Street Railway Company to be arranged between the parties so that the least injury and inconvenience may be suffered by the Street Railway Company. Any matters of difference may be spoken to upon any further hearing."

No arrangement having been come to between the parties, the Lachine Jacques-Cartier & Maisonneuve Railway Company made an application to the board showing that it required, for the purposes of its right-of-way, a portion of lot No. 340, parish of St. Laurent, consisting of a strip of land 597 feet in length by 100 feet in width, containing 1·62 arpents, as shown on the location plan and on page 70 of the book of reference in connection with Order No. 13993, of June 12, 1911, approving, under section 159 of the Railway Act, the location of the railway from its westerly terminus to a point near Iberville street.

The order which the company required was one that would enable it to take the lands above mentioned, which lands belonged to the Montreal Tramways Company, a provincial corporation—which had acquired them (the said lands) from the Montreal Park & Island Railway Company, a Dominion corporation, agreeably to enabling legislation passed by both the Dominion Parliament and the province of Quebec. In other words, the property which the applicant company sought to take is the property referred to in the paragraph above and set out in Order No. 13993,—which property, or lands, the said company desired to take under the provisions of section 176 of the Railway Act.

After several written statements were filed on behalf of the different parties,—the main contention on behalf of the Montreal Tramways Company being that the board had no jurisdiction to grant the application,—the following order was issued by the board.

"THE BOARD OF RAILWAY COMMISSIONERS FOR CANADA,

"Saturday, the 20th day of July, A.D., 1912.

"D'ARCY SCOTT, Assistant Chief Commissioner.

"S. J. MCLEAN, Commissioner.

"IN THE MATTER of the Order of the Board No. 13993, dated June 12, 1911, approving the location of the Lachine, Jacques-Cartier and Maisonneuve Railway Company's line of railway from the westerly terminus of its railway to a point about 400 feet west of the Canadian Pacific Railway Company's crossing at Iberville street subway, in the city of Montreal; and the application of the Lachine, Jacques-Cartier and Maisonneuve Railway Company for authority to take, for the construction of its railway, a portion of lot No. 340, in the parish of St. Laurent, in the said city of Montreal, of the lands of the Montreal Park and Island Railway Company, consisting of a strip 597 feet in length and 100 feet in width, containing 1·62 arpents, as shown on the plan dated June 12, 1911, and approved under the said Order No. 13993.

"UPON reading what is alleged in support of the application and on behalf of the Montreal Park and Island Railway Company, and the report of the Chief Engineer of the board—

"IT IS ORDERED that the applicant company be, and it is hereby, authorized to take, for the purpose of the crossing, that portion of the said lot No. 340, of the lands of the Montreal Park and Island Railway Company consisting of a strip of land 597 feet in length by 100 feet in width, containing 1·62 arpents, as shown on the said plan.

"(Sgd.) D'ARCY SCOTT.

"*Assistant Chief Commissioner,*

"*Board of Railway Commissioners for Canada.*"

A petition was then filed by the Montreal Tramways Company, addressed to the Supreme Court, praying for leave to appeal from the above order; and leave was granted by order dated 30th September, 1912.

Judgment was delivered by a majority of the Supreme Court, in June, 1914, allowing the appeal on the ground that the order appealed from was beyond the jurisdiction of the board.

The Lachine, Jacques-Cartier and Maisonneuve Railway Company has since applied for an order to complete Order No. 13993, so as to allow that company to take the necessary proceedings under the Railway Act and acquire the right-of-way for the construction of its railway.

The application was heard at a sitting of the board held in Ottawa on December 7, 1914.

I am at a loss to understand why the company, in its former application, relied on the provisions of section 176. So far as that section is concerned, the applicant company—although originally under provincial jurisdiction—having become a Dominion Company under the provisions of the Dominion Act 1-2 Geo. V, Chapter 104, is a company subject to the provisions of the section. It is equally true that the property in question, although once owned by a company subject to Dominion jurisdiction, is now the property of a railway company subject to provincial jurisdiction.

The settled practice of the board has been to interpret the Act as applying merely to railways subject to Dominion jurisdiction, apart from specific sections in which provincial railways are dealt with; and, as a result, the board has held that the provisions of the section relied on by the applicant company apply only to a railway within the legislative authority of the Parliament of Canada,—one chartered by an Act of the Dominion Parliament or declared to be a work for the general advantage of Canada (Preston & Berlin Street Railway Company *v.* Grand Trunk Railway Company, 6 C.R.C. 142, St. John and Quebec Railway Company *v.* Canadian Pacific Railway Company, 14 C.R.C. 360.)

At the same time it is but fair to say that it would seem to be difficult—the order being considered entirely apart from the application and therefore apart from section 176—to give effect to it (the order) owing to the fact, *inter alia,* that the lands are not in any sense required for crossing purposes. The railway which the applicant company proposes to construct does not cross the right-of-way of the Montreal Tramways Company and the land sought to be taken when the order was made had no track on it. As the Montreal Tramways Company operates on the city streets, any crossing of its tracks would seem to be a matter which would arise in an application to cross a highway, which, of course, is not the case here.

At the hearing, Perron, K.C., who appeared for the Montreal Tramways Company, again raised the question of jurisdiction, arguing that the only tribunal competent to pass upon the issue was the Quebec Public Utilities Commission.

In considering this latter question, it occurred to me that the Quebec legislation gave its commission jurisdiction merely to adjudicate upon disputes as to crossings of electric railways; so an opportunity was given to Mr. Perron to make any further argument he desired on the question; and his statement is as follows:

> "Under section 740 of the Revised Statutes of Quebec, the commission has jurisdiction: '(*a*) In all matters within the jurisdiction of the Railway Committee of the Executive Council, to which committee it is hereby substituted and with the powers of which it is hereby vested.'
>
> "The land which the Lachine, Jacques-Cartier & Maisonneuve Railway Company now seeks to obtain possession of forms part of the railway of the Montreal Tramways Company.
>
> "Paragraph 7 of section 6474 of the Revised Statutes of Quebec enacts: 'That the railway company shall have power and authority to purchase land for and erect houses, factories, warehouses, elevators, docks, offices, and workshops.'
>
> "Paragraph 9 of the same section No. 6474 gave power and authority to the company: 'To cross or intersect any other railway.'
>
> "Paragraph 20 of the same section enacts: 'No railway company shall avail itself of any of the powers contained in paragraph 19 of this article, without appliction to the railway committee, constituted under article 6670, for approval of the mode of junction, crossing or intersection purposes.'
>
> "I, therefore, suggest that the jurisdiction given by the Revised Statutes of Quebec to the Quebec Public Utilities Commission by article 6705 is not limitative, but simply indicates some of its powers.
>
> "I will be very pleased to supply you with any further information if same is required."

In being asked to complete his argument on the question, his further statement is as follows:

> "I beg to state that our suggestion is based mainly on the fact that the Board of Railway Commissioners for Canada have no jurisdiction over a provincial railway. Our reasons for that contention are fully explained in our factum in the case of the Montreal Park and Island Railway Company and The Lachine, Jacques-Cartier and Maisonneuve Railway Company, a copy of which we now enclose. See page 5, point two, Unconstitutionality.
>
> "If we are right in this contention, it seems to us that the sections of the Revised Statutes which we quoted to you the other day give ample jurisdiction to the Quebec Public Utilities Commission to settle the matter."

A reference to the Quebec Act shows that no attempt has been made by the Legislature of that province to assert any jurisdiction over Dominion lines. Section 15 of the Revised Statutes deals with railways; and the interpretation articles 6470 (1) and 6471 (10 and 11) make it clear that the railway companies subject to the provisions of the Act are companies incorporated under the provisions of the Quebec Consolidated Railway Act of 1880, or under the Revised Statutes of the Province of 1888, or subsequent provincial legislation.

Again, section 3, article 719, and following articles appointing the Quebec Public Utilities Commission, do not attempt to confer upon the commission any jurisdiction over a Dominion line.

The opinion I hold regarding the Quebec legislation I find to be similar to that held by the Quebec Commission. At page 40 of the Commission's Annual Report for the year ending July 31, 1911, reference is made to the complaint of one Hemming as follows:

> "A complaint that the crossing of the tracks of the Grand Trunk Railway Company by the track of the respondent (The Montreal Street Railway Company) at Guy street, Montreal, is very dangerous, and that a change of service between Centre street and Notre Dame street should be inaugurated. The respondent filed exception to the jurisdiction of the Commission and after a hearing upon this question the following finding was issued: 'Whereas the change in respect of the Guy street crossing would involve the Montreal Street Railway Company traversing tracks of the Grand Trunk Railway Company at another point than is permitted, and inasmuch as the Grand Trunk Railway Company is subject to the jurisdiction of the Board of Railway Commissioners for Canada, and this Commission has no authority to order such a crossing, the Commission is declared to be without jurisdiction to grant that portion of the complainant's demand. . . . .'"

In any event, the question as to whether or not jurisdiction has been assumed by a province to deal with the issue in this case, can have little or nothing to do with the determination of the main question,—that question being whether, under the British North America Act, the Dominion Parliament, when it authorizes the construction of a national railway on a route fixed by Parliament, has the power to carry the project into effect, notwithstanding that to do so may entail the expropriation of a right-of-way not only through the property of private individuals but also through the property of a provincial railway company.

This question obviously cannot depend upon the extent to which provincial authority might, on the one hand, desire to aid a Dominion project, or, on the other, decide to authorize the construction of local railways in such a manner as to defeat a Dominion undertaking.

As a necessary and ancillary power, I am of the opinion that the Dominion's right to legislate is absolute. In the case of railways, there is no doubt as to the

necessity for the power. There is no question but that the necessity to expropriate land for the construction of a Dominion railway is much greater than the necessity to authorize a telephone company to place and keep its poles on certain highways. A telephone pole line can be deflected easily, and at small cost; while deflection of a railway line might well be so expensive as to become prohibitive, and, if deflected, the deflection might defeat a proper object of the undertaking. This being so, I am of the opinion that the issue in this case, proceeding in the manner in which it is now being dealt with, is covered by the judgment of Iddington, J., delivered in the appeal between these parties in the Supreme Court, following as it does the judgment of the Privy Council in Toronto *vs.* Bell Telephone Company (1905), A. C. 52; Attorney General of British Columbia *vs.* C.P.R. Co. (1906), A. C. 204.

It may be noted that, in the Bell Telephone Case, the local legislature had dealt with the subject, and had provided that no telephone poles should be erected on certain public streets without the consent of the municipalities, which are in most cases the owners of the streets.

I should also make reference to the case of the Attorney General of Alberta *v.* the Attorney General of Canada *et al* (1914), 31 Times Law Reports, 32.

The Dominion right I regard as merely ancillary to the main legislative power, with the result that provincial companies cannot be interfered with, except to the extent that the rights-of-way of Dominion companies have to be carried over the property of provincial companies, in order that effect may be given to the object of the Dominion incorporation. Manifestly, then, the board cannot, as has been suggested, authorize the taking of the railway system or right-of-way of a provincial company merely for the convenience of a Dominion company.

It may also be said that, in so far as the crossing of Dominion lines by provincial lines is concerned the practice of the board has been to treat the provincial applicants just as it treats Dominion applicants. Were the situation here reversed and a provincial company desired to cross a Dominion line, the appropriate order would be made as a matter of course.

To illustrate this practice as being applicable not only to existing local railways but also to contemplated lines, reference may be had to the application of the Southern Central Pacific Railway Company (a Dominion company), for the approval of its location plans (File No. 16355). At the hearing, the interest of the Alberta Pacific Railway Company (a provincial company), having been developed, Mabee, C.C., in delivering the judgment of the board said:

". . . . . .that where a provincial corporation with a provincial charter gets its location plan approved by the local railway minister, and then files its location plan, being then in a position to go ahead with its construction legally according to the laws of the province,—that where that is done a federal railway is not entitled to come to this board and obtain a location that will throw it and the provincially incorporated company into endless conflict and turmoil."

Holding then, as I do, that this board has jurisdiction to authorize the expropriation of the land necessary for the construction and operation of the applicant company's railway, although the said land is owned by the Tramways Company, I must now consider the question as to whether the expropriation should or should not be authorized.

Mr. Perron complains that, in the former argument the company had been treated by the board as having no more rights than a farmer. In one sense, such an attitude would be defensible. As a mere land owner the company occupies no better position than any other land owner would occupy. On the other hand, the company being a public utility existing for the convenience of the public, it has a right to ask that the interests of that section of the public which patronizes, or may patronize, its system, should not be injuriously affected. The controlling consideration always is the public interest and convenience, and whether that interest and convenience are

served by a provincial or a Dominion corporation makes no difference, and further, if there be a conflict of public interest, the question will again narrow itself down, not to one of advantage to either a Dominion or a Provincial corporation, but as to how the greater public interest or convenience is to be attained. At the time the original Order No. 13993 was made, there was no question as to the congestion of the Montreal terminals of the Grand Trunk Railway Company, a company controlling and owning the Lachine, Jacques-Cartier and Maisonneuve Railway, whose business it would be to relieve the congestion which existed. Mr. Perron, at the hearing, frankly admitted that there was no question as to the necessity of the line to relieve this congestion. The company has gone on acquiring the right-of-way authorized, and has already acquired property at a cost of $1,439,000. In addition to this, it has expropriated other properties, the awards as to the value of which are now in appeal, which awards call for a further payment of some $150,000. The Tramways Company has so far built nothing on the land which is sought to be taken except that since the former application, it has extended a track from its repair shop across it for a distance of some four hundred feet north of the proposed right-of-way. The board's engineer reports that at present this track is not being used, but the applicants' line must be constructed at such an elevation as will insure a clearance of fifteen feet over it, so that the use of this track will not be interfered with. To the south of the strip which is sought to be expropriated, it has the shop used for repairing cars. It was stated at the hearing that the largest number of cars ever in the shop at one time was seventy-five; and, after the hearing a further inspection was made, in order that the exact facts might be ascertained, when the Chief Engineer of the board learned that the barn in question was used only as a repair shop, and that there were then in the so-called repair shop forty-two cars, being overhauled and painted. The property which the Tramways Company now owns to the east of the said car shop will give the applicant company enough room to extend the shop to double its present size.

Under the circumstances, it is impossible to find that public interest will in any way be jeopardized by granting the order applied for.

It was said at the hearing that, if the railway was raised some 25 feet above the land and constructed on a span, the Tramways Company would withdraw its opposition, I shall be glad if an arrangement of some sort can be made between the parties; but no case has been made out which would warrant the board in ordering the applicant company to make such an elevation of its line. When the land is being expropriated, the Tramways Company will, of course, state its claims for damages before the arbitrator, and argue as it may think proper regarding the possible effect of such terms as the board might have imposed upon the company.

The lands that the applicant company requires are no more than the statutory right-of-way, which may be expropriated under the general order approving the location. The expropriation, therefore, could have been made under Order No. 13993, had it not been for the provisions of sub-paragraph (d) of the order. No arrangement having been made between the parties, as the board hoped, an order amending the original order by striking out the sub-paragraph referred to, will go as of this date.

Commissioner McLean concurred.

APPLICATION OF THE FORT WILLIAM BOARD OF TRADE FOR THE ESTABLISHMENT OF A CARTAGE SERVICE AT FORT WILLIAM; OR, FOR THE ABOLITION OF THE CUSTOM OF THE RAILWAY COMPANY OF COLLECTING THE CONSIGNOR'S CARTAGE FROM THE CONSIGNEE.

Judgment, Assistant Chief Commissioner SCOTT, February 5, 1915:

The railway companies have agreements with cartage companies in a number of cities and towns in Canada whereby the cartage company undertakes to call for and

deliver freight for the railway companies on a schedule of charges. These cartage companies are not under the jurisdiction of the board, and it is purely optional with a railway company to have such a service.

This board has no jurisdiction to order a railway company to establish a cartage service, and therefore we cannot grant the request of the applicants for an order directing the railway company to establish a cartage service at Fort William. With regard to the practice which the railway companies have been following in some places of collecting the consignor's cartage charges from the consignees when collecting the freight for the railway haul, it seems to me the remedy for this evil is in the hands of the consignees themselves. If they do not want to pay the consignor's cartage to the railway company, I see no obligation on them to do so. The railway company has no right to withhold delivery of the freight because the consignees refuse to pay the consignor's cartage; and, as the cartage appears as a sperate item on the freight bill, it would be a simple matter for the consignee to deduct that amount from the total amount demanded by the railway company.

The matter came before the board under File No. 18663-30 some years ago, and a memorandum of Mr. Commissioner McLean, concurred in by the chief commissioner, dated September 25, 1913, was issued to the railway companies and a number of boards of trade—a copy being sent to the secretary of the Fort William Board of Trade by the secretary of this board, in a letter dated October 13, 1913. A notice having been issued by the railway companies to the effect that it was the intention of the railway companies to discontinue the practice of collecting the consignor's cartage charges from the consignee, a strong protest was made to the board by delegates of a number of western shippers at a conference at Regina on December 18, 1913, against the withdrawal of this practice by the railway companies. A number of boards of trade of western cities joined in the protest.

As a result of this protest, representatives of the Grand Trunk Pacific and the Canadian Pacific railway companies, by memorandum dated December 19, 1913, agreed to continue the practice of collecting consignor's cartage charges from consignees in cases where the railway companies had recognized cartage agents at the point of shipment.

I entirely agree with the views expressed by Mr. Commissioner McLean in his memorandum already referred to, when he says:—

> "The question as to whether the consignees should, or should not pay advanced cartage to the railway is one entirely of contract between the parties. The board has nothing to do with it, nor is the work done by the railway in any manner a railway service or facility within the meaning of the Railway Act."

That being so, I do not see that the board can take any action in this matter.

Commissioner Goodeve concurred.

COMPLAINT OF MR. JUSTICE FORTIN, OF MONTREAL, QUEBEC, AGAINST CANCELLATION OF 8 O'CLOCK P.M. TRAIN FROM ST. JEROME TO MONTREAL, P.Q., ON THE LINE OF THE CANADIAN PACIFIC RAILWAY.

Judgment Chief Commissioner DRAYTON, February 10, 1915:

On taking the complaint up with the railway company, the company claimed that, owing to conditions prevailing at the present time, it was necessary for it to reduce its train service where possible and to continue such reduction until business conditions improved.

The board has since investigated the situation with a view of determining whether or not the business between St. Jerome and Montreal would warrant an order being made by the board restoring the former service.

The train, the discontinuance of which is complained of, was known as St. Jerome No. 436, formerly scheduled to leave St. Jerome at 8 a.m., Ste. Rose at 8.33 a.m., and to arrive at Montreal at 9.20 a.m. The board's inspector has tabulated the number of passengers carried on the train for the week November 24 to November 30, inclusive, as follows:—

November 24	88	passengers.
" 25	80	"
" 26	103	"
" 27	65	"
" 28	55	"
" 29	66	"
" 30	124	"

He also reports that the bulk of the passengers carried are people engaged in various businesses either at Montreal or at intermediate stations between St. Jerome and Montreal, or those going to shop at Montreal, with the result that the greater part of the traffic does not take the train so as to get to work at a fixed hour.

The earlier trains operated between St. Eustache, St. Therèse, and Montreal, namely, Nos. 478 and 470, scheduled arriving at Montreal at 7.45 and 8.45 a.m. respectively, carry to a great extent (the inspector reports), people of the labouring class having to be at their work at eight and nine a.m. as the case may be.

The report further says that as the traffic did not warrant the service of two trains, the Canadian Pacific Railway Company, in changing time effective January 17, 1915, consolidated at St. Therese train No. 436 with the St. Eustache train No. 478 arriving at Place Viger station in Montreal at 7.45 a.m.

It appears that the complainant, Mr. Justice Fortin, lives at Ste. Rose and has regularly travelled by the train that has been cancelled.

Under the new train arrangements, a train leaves St. Jerome at 6.25 a.m. due at Ste. Rose at 7.01 a.m. and arriving at Montreal at 7.45 a.m. The next morning train is the limited No. 470, which is scheduled to stop at Ste. Rose at 8 a.m., arriving at Montreal at 8.45 a.m.

The result is, of course, that the complainant must leave Ste. Rose at 8 a.m. instead of at 8.34 a.m. as under the previous schedule.

There is no doubt that some inconvenience attends the rearrangement; but, unfortunately, there is also no doubt that traffic conditions at present are such as to require economy in operation, with the further result that the traffic conditions are not such as to warrant the service formerly enjoyed.

Under the circumstances, in my opinion, the application should be dismissed.

Assistant Chief Commissioner Scott concurred.

APPLICATION OF THE CANADIAN NORTHERN ONTARIO RAILWAY COMPANY FOR APPROVAL OF LOCATION THROUGH THE TOWN OF NORTH BAY.

Judgment Chief Commissioner DRAYTON, February 10, 1915:

The location plan of the Canadian Northern Ontario Railway Company through the town of North Bay was approved by Order No. 17906 after a hearing held in the town of North Bay at which the different interests were represented.

Street crossings were considered at a later sitting of the board held in North Bay for the purpose, and were approved by Order No. 20500. The latter order, although opposed by different interests, were nevertheless made by the board on the basis of an agreement (a copy of which was placed on file with the board), between the corporation of the town of North Bay and the railway company.

Under the agreement the corporation agreed to close those parts of Regina, Sherbrooke, Commercial, Second avenue, and Cedar streets covered by the right-of-way of the railway, and to close Fraser street, subject to a passage for pedestrians being provided. All was according to the plan made part of the agreement.

The corporation also agreed to take the necessary proceedings at the expense of the company to expropriate land for the purpose of opening and extending MacLaren street, as shown on the plan, and on similar terms to open up a street from Marion street to Front street, and another street connecting Front street with Second avenue.

The company agreed, among other things, "to pay all the expenses or damages which may be legally claimed by property owners, or otherwise, and which can be legally claimed under the Railway Act and the Municipal Act, or under either of them, or both, or any other damages by reason of the building of the railway through the town that can legally be recovered."

The company is also bound to build certain subways called for by the agreement, according to detail plans to be approved of by the board, and to make and maintain level crossings at certain other points.

Order No. 20500 adopts the different solutions of railway crossings covered by the agreement; and as to the question of liability, again acting in ease of the agreement, but without adding to it, paragraph No. 5 of the order provides:—

> "That the company be responsible for any damages which property owners affected may be legally entitled to recover under the Railway Act and the Municipal Act."

Under these circumstances, an application is now made by the company for an order settling and determining what properties are damaged by the railway construction or in respect of any other matter arising from the carrying out of the agreement or of the order. In short, the railway company desires that the board should now determine definitely the zone of legal damage or interference.

I am of the opinion that no such order should be made. By the agreement between the parties damages legally recoverable either under the Railway Act or the Municipal Act are to be paid by the railway company. The effect of the agreement is that the town is to be at no responsibility for damages; and further that no ratepayer otherwise entitled to damages is to be deprived of his right. Under these circumstances, the board should not seek to limit the contractual obligation of a railway company or anyone else. Apart from right, there is, in any event, no jurisdiction to do so. Under the scheme of the Railway Act, damages are to be paid for lands actually taken, and to the extent that the sections permit, damage resulting to other property. The board had no power to abrogate or limit any right to these damages; and if it had the power, it certainly never should have and never has attempted to exercise it. The general statutory provisions have been amended by 1-2 George V, chapter 22, section 6, which adds to section 235 (this section dealing with the right of the board to authorize highway crossings), the following provision:—

> "Subject to the company making such compensation to adjacent or abutting landowners as the board deems proper, the railway of the company."

Mr. Temple, for the railway company, relies on this amendment as justifying the order that he now asks. The amendment is not designated to limit, but in certain cases where, in the opinion of the board, the existing statutory provisions as to compensation are not sufficient to extend the right of compensation to owners that otherwise would not be entitled to recover.

Before this section was passed, under the Railway Act, an owner of property abutting on a street along which a railway track was constructed was entitled to no damage, there being no physical taking of his property. Under the amendment, in a proper case, the board may provide in its order dealing with the location of the track along the street, that compensation should be paid. In any event, in this case no action was taken by the board under the amendment, and the rights of property owners were not in any way dealt with under it. Instead of the matter being so considered, the question is covered by the agreement referred to. It is quite clear

that this agreement never contemplated the board in its discretion saying that it should or should not apply to certain property. The test of the railway company's liability must remain as to its own acts, under the general provisions of the Railway Act, and as to the legal acts of the corporation in carrying out its part of the agreement under the provisions of the Municipal Act.

Apart from negligence coupled with the proper legal authority under the Act, the question would seem to be entirely covered by the principles discussed in *re* Medler and Arnott v. Toronto, 4 C.R.C., page 13. There, as in this case, the city agreed to close a portion of a street; and in that instance the railway company agreed to pay any person whose lands were injuriously affected by any act of the city in the execution of the agreement, compensation.

In so far as property owners are concerned, their remedy therefore, would seem to be a remedy against the municipality recoverable by arbitration proceedings under the Municipal Act, the railway company being responsible to the city for the amount of compensation arrived at.

In so far as the railway construction, including subway work, is concerned, the railway company's responsibility is governed by the general clauses of the Railway Act.

The question, however, of whether the different matters done either by the corporation or the company and causing damages result in legal responsibility for damages recoverable under the appropriate section dealing with arbitration, or by action, is entirely one for the courts.

Assistant Chief Commissioner Scott concurred.

APPLICATION OF THE CANADIAN NORTHERN QUEBEC RAILWAY COMPANY, UNDER SECTIONS 222 AND 237, FOR AUTHORITY TO CONSTRUCT SIDINGS ACROSS STADACONA AND MARLBOROUGH STREETS IN HOCHELAGA WARD, MONTREAL, QUE.

Judgment, Mr. Commissioner McLEAN, February 12, 1915:—

The plan submitted shows provision for two track extensions of the yard facilities of the Canadian Northern Quebec Railway Company, these being by way of addition to their Moreau street yards. The additional trackage extends westerly from the point of connection with the existing tracks, such point of connection being north of Stadacona street. There are already shown nine tracks crossing Stadacona street. The sanction is asked for the crossings of Stadacona and Marlborough streets. The property upon which the tracks will be located, aside from that involved in the street crossings, is owned by the railway. The Moreau street yards, which are located west of Moreau street and north of St. Catherine street, provide facilities for some 40 cars. The tracks in this yard continue southerly to the northern side of St. Catherine street, where they take up the space between Moreau and Marlborough streets. Where they cross Robillard street, which is parallel to and north of St. Catherine street, there are thirteen tracks. It will be seen that the section east of Marlborough street, as defined, is used exclusively for railway purposes. The trackage involved in connection with the application of the Canadian Northern Quebec Railway Company to cross Stadacona and Marlborough streets will give, as checked, about twelve cars additional capacity.

Marlborough street, at the north end, has a gate which gives access on to the property of the Canadian Pacific Railway Company. It is not a through street at the north end. Stadacona street, at the west, is also a dead end street, the Canadian Pacific Railway Company's property being west thereof. On the north side of Stadacona street, all the property between the point where the proposed tracks will cross this street and the northeast corner of Stadacona and Marlborough streets, belongs to the applicant railway. The property on the east side of Marlborough street, from the corner of Marlborough and Stadacona streets north to the end of the street, is

also owned by the railway. On the west side of Marlborough street and north of Stadacona street, lot 112 is not owned by the railway. On the south side of Stadacona street lot 117, which is immediately west of the proposed trackage of the railway, as shown on the plan, this lot being bounded on the west by the Canadian Pacific property, is not owned by the railway. As to these lots, 112 and 117, it was stated by the railway that negotiations were being carried on by it with the property owners. No representation of any kind was made at the hearing by representatives of the owners of the lots in question.

The city of Montreal filed objections, which were further developed at the hearing, setting out (1) that the laying of these additional tracks on Stadacona and Marlborough streets would seriously inconvenience and interefere with the movement of traffic on these streets, it being stated, that the traffic is already seriously inconvenienced; (2) that the application, if granted, would very detrimentally effect the property belonging to private owners. It was stated that it was part of the plan of the railway to convert by piece-meal into a railway yard that portion of the territory of the city of Montreal between Moreau street, the Canadian Pacific Railway Company, and St. Catherine street. The city was of opinion that two additional tracks should be permitted to be laid across the streets in question, only when the railway had acquired definite title to all the property included in this section north of St. Catherine street.

Reference was made to certain property owners affected, it being stated that the following lots, which still were in private possession, would be detrimentally affected by the laying of additional tracks. The lots in question are 112, 116, 117, 125, 128, 129, 130, 136 and 139; all the lots from 129 to 145 in block 148. It was stated by the city that the railway company already owns about half the land between Marlborough street, the Canadian Pacific Railway Company, and St. Catherine street.

Lots 112 and 117 have already been referred to as being lots concerning which the railway was in negotiation with the owners. Lot 116 is south of Stadacona street, and is not shown on the plan as having any direct access thereto. Its access is by way of Beaufort street, which is a blind end street running south from the Canadian Pacific Railway Company's property to St. Catherine street and parallel to Marlborough street. Lots 124 and 125 are south of lots 117 and 116 respectively. They have no frontage on Stadacona street or direct means of access thereto, the access being from Robillard street, which is not a through street, and which is parallel to and south of Stadacona street. Lots 128, 129 and 130 have no frontage on Stadacona street, and have no direct access thereto. They are situated on the south side of Robillard street, in the section extending from the southwest corner of Seaver and Robillard streets to the southeast corner of Robillard and Marlborough streets. Lot 136 has no direct access to Stadacona street, and is located on the east side of Beaufort street. Lots 138 and 139 are located on St. Catherine street. The lots 145 to 129, in block 148, inclusive, are on the west side of Beaufort street, running from the north end of the street to where it connects with St. Catherine street on the south.

It will thus be seen that, aside from lots 112 and 117, there are not in the list of lots as given any lots facing on and having direct access to Stadacona street. Lot 130 has frontage on Marlborough street, one block south of the proposed point of crossing.

The issue as to the additional lots is raised by the city and was also raised at the hearing by Alderman Lapointe, who is a landowner in the section which has been defined. Another landowner, not resident within the defined section, also raised the question.

The laying out of railway facilities in a given section, while for the advantage of the general public, has a particular effect upon the value of adjoining property. This effect may be by way of depreciation of its value for residential purposes. It may

equally be by enhancing its value as a result of the demand for it for railway purposes in the limited area readily available for said purposes.

The section, on a portion of which the railway desires to construct the facilities necessitating the crossings asked for, is bounded on the north and west by the property of the Canadian Pacific Railway Company, on the east by the Moreau Street yard of the Canadian Northern Railway Company, the western boundary of this yard being the east side of Marlborough street, and on the south by St. Catherine street. In the section defined, there are the following structures: two small wooden sheds on lot 109; on the south side of lot 117, there is a portion of a wooden shed which extends south to the southern boundary of lot 124; on the south side of lot 124 there is also a wooden shed which extends westerly some distance into lot 125; on lot 126 there is a metal-covered building; on the west side of lot 127, there is a shed; at the eastern end of lot 139 there is a wooden shed; on lot 138 there is a building used as an hotel, and there is also a wooden shed.

While objection is taken to the crossing of the streets, the more fundamental objection on the part of the city is that in regard to the property owners. The nature of the traffic along the northern end of Marlborough street and along Stadacona street is already fixed. It cannot, in view of the situation as it is on the ground, be a vehicular and pedestrian traffic of importance. There are already nine tracks across Stadacona street; that is to say, Stadacona street is the throat of the Moreau street yard. Stadacona street has no local development in it which calls for traffic; and it is a blind end street being closed by the C.P.R. property at the west. Marlborough street north of the intersection of Stadacona street has no local development on it which calls for vehicular and pedestrian traffic.

The board has had before it the insufficiency of facilities in the Hochelaga yard. So far back as February 8, 1913, Evidence Volume 173, p. 1823, the Chief Commissioner used the following language: "Take the situation to-day, the Hochelaga yard is manifestly insufficient for the purposes of the business, and the companies frankly admit that."

In the course of the present hearing, Mr. Tilston, speaking for the Board of Trade, used the following language:

> "Mr. TILSTON: Yes, sir. I would like to say a word, not as to the property feature, but as to the Canadian Northern terminal facilities in Montreal.
>
> "This first came up as a result of the complaint of the Board of Trade. An investigation was made by the board of the Canadian Northern terminals, and the case was heard in this court house with Mr. Drayton presiding, when the Canadian Northern promised to acquire team tracks in this end of the town. The facts are that the Canadian Northern have very limited facilities for unloading carload traffic and when business is normal are holding out daily thirty cars. These additional facilities will give accommodation for twenty cars more, and I am sure that extra accommodation will be very greatly appreciated by the shippers as well as the merchants. As to the property rights in the matter I know nothing whatever."

The conditions which the board may impose in its orders must fall within the scope of its powers as laid down in the Railway Act. Where the board in granting permission to a railway to cross a street does this in the face of the protest of the municipality, it must be satisfied that the crossing is in the public interest. Section 237 of the Railway Act provides that the board may—

> "grant such application upon such terms and conditions as to protection, safety, and convenience of the public as it may deem expedient——"

It is not empowered to affix as a condition of granting the crossing the acquisition of additional land. Not even in such a case as the present, where it is not denied by the

railway that additional land is being obtained by it in this section, looking to additional facilities to those involved in the present application. If the board cannot do this on the main application, should it by indirection, by refusing to grant the application, attempt to obtain the same result? If it is satisfied that the additional facilities as proposed are necessary in the public interest, is it justified in hampering the public by refusing to deal with the matter till a more comprehensive scheme is developed?

There is no question but that the additional facilities are needed. Under normal conditions, the railway has to hold out about thirty cars from the yard. It is in the public interest that the application should be granted.

Assistant Chief Commissioner Scott concurred.

Deputy Chief Commissioner NANTEL: I concur in the judgment of Commissioner McLean, being of the opinion that the commercial interests of Montreal demand an extension of terminal facilities by the Canadian Northern Quebec Railway Company. As to this fact, there can be no question.

The objection that appealed to me at the hearing was not so much the construction which is now proposed, or the extension of the present track over lot 117 and over lots 124 and 125 on the north side of Robillard street, but a possible extension over Robillard street through lots 126, 127, 136 and 137, and stopping just north of the hotel premises belonging to Alderman Lapointe. This is the construction that, according to the alderman, is contemplated, and he fears that his property will be greatly injured thereby. I find, however, that this construction cannot be made without the leave of the board, as Robillard street must be passed. The interests, therefore, of Alderman Lapointe and other property owners can be effectively considered should occasion arise on such application.

LACHINE, JACQUES CARTIER AND MAISONNEUVE RAILWAY COMPANY, CROSSING OF IBERVILLE, DE FLEURIMONT, POUPART, AND COMTE STREETS, MONTREAL.

Judgment Assistant Chief Commissioner SCOTT, February 13, 1915:

Some time ago the board authorized the construction of the line of the Lachine, Jacques-Cartier and Maisonneuve Railway through the eastern part of the city of Montreal. I believe the line, when constructed, is to be used by the Grand Trunk Railway Company as access to a number of industries in the eastern part of the city.

By Order No. 16181, dated March 26, 1912, the board authorized the railway company to cross Iberville and DeFleurimont streets; and by Order No. 17763, dated October 16, 1912, a detailed plan of a bridge to carry these two streets over the railway was approved. This plan shows a diversion in Iberville street so as to provide a crossing of the street over the railway at an acute angle.

Mr. John Molson, of the city of Montreal, has an interest in a large tract of land in the vicinity of the crossings in question. Counsel for Mr. Molson has appeared before the board and urged the importance of having a convenient method of access for getting from one side of the tracks of the railway to the other on the highways which run through the Molson property, and asked that no diversion in Iberville street be allowed.

Since the hearing, accompanied by the chief engineer and chief operating officer of the board, I have examined the location of the railway at the crossings in question. Iberville street, which runs in a northwesterly direction, is the most important of the streets in question. It has a car line on it to the southeast of the proposed crossing, and it is expected that the street car tracks will be continued on Iberville street to a point some distance northwest of the proposed crossing. The railway where it crosses Iberville street runs approximately east and west. The crossing is, therefore, on a skew. The grade of the railway is sufficiently below the grade of the street to

permit of the street being carried over the railway by bridge with practically no change in the grade of highway. The point at issue is whether the street should be diverted to cross over the railway at right angles to it; or, whether the highway should be carried in a straight line over the railway. The latter method is more expensive as it requires longer spans in the bridge and large abutments to support it. Our chief engineer reports that the cost of a bridge for a diverted highway—the plan of which was approved by Order No. 17763—would cost about $16,500. The cost of a bridge 50 feet in width carrying the highway in a straight line over the railway, he suggests would cost about $33,000. Bearing in mind the development of the territory and the importance which Iberville street is beginning to assume, I am of opinion that a bridge carrying the highway on a straight line over the railway should not be required by the board notwithstanding its previous order. It will be sufficient for the present at any rate that the bridge at Iberville street be 50 feet in width. By Order No. 7331, dated June 8, 1909, the Canadian Pacific Railway Company, pursuant to an agreement with the city of Montreal, was permitted to build a subway on Iberville street carrying the street under the tracks of the railway about a quarter of a mile southeast of the crossing now being considered. At that subway a width of 48 feet is all that is allowed. That being so, I think that 50 feet in width should be sufficient for the bridge in question. Of course a bridge of this nature can always be added to, so that additional width can be secured at a later date if necessary.

Having decided that Iberville street was not to be diverted, the best disposition of the De Fleurimont street crossing is, to require that that street should not be diverted and should be carried over the railway tracks by a bridge. De Fleurimont street crosses Iberville street at right angles at the point where the railway is to pass underneath Iberville street. Therefore, the one bridge at Iberville street can be constructed so as to serve De Fleurimont street at the same time.

With reference to the crossing of Poupart and Comte streets, Mr. Mountain reports to the board as follows:—

> "I do not think the application to close and divert Comte and Poupart streets is a proper one considering the amount of settlement in that vicinity at this time. For the present I would suggest that Comte street be left open. The width of the street is now 60 feet. It seems to me that a 40-foot bridge for vehicular and pedestrian traffic only would be sufficient. Poupart street to be diverted along the east side of the right of way into Comte street. This is not a very heavy diversion."

I think this would be a fair disposition to make of this matter; except that, it might be left optional with the railway company to build a bridge carrying Poupart street over the railway instead of diverting it to use the Comte street bridge, if it wished to save itself the expense of indemnifying the landowners who would be injured by the diversion of Poupart street. Of course if Poupart street is diverted the railway company would have to pay damages to those who will suffer by it.

Before any work is done, detail plans of the bridges in question would have to be submitted to the board for approval of its engineer.

An order may go accordingly.

Deputy Chief Commissioner Nantel and Commissioner McLean concurred.

Re DISCONTINUING EMPLOYMENT OF STATION AGENTS.

Judgment, Chief Commissioner DRAYTON, February 15, 1915:

Applications have been made by the railway companies for authority to discontinue the employment of agents at a number of stations. By far the greater number of applications relate to stations west of Port Arthur. The companies claim that business to a

large extent has suddenly stopped; that former earnings no longer give any indication as to whether or not stations should be kept open; that, at any rate for the present, railway operations in the west are accompanied by conditions entirely different from those under which they were formerly carried on; and that the traffic, instead of being remunerative as in the past, has become unremunerative owing to the great declension of tonnage.

In view of the careful consideration only recently given to all rates west of Port Arthur, no raise in freight rates could be justified by the companies, nor should any be granted by the board. The only relief in operating conditions, therefore, that can well be granted is to aid the railways in operating as cheaply as they possibly can in a manner consistent with the public interest.

In so far as a decrease in earnings is concerned, there is no room for argument.

The gross earnings on the Canadian Northern Railway from the first of July, 1913, to the week ending January 14, 1914, amounted to $14,092,400. For the corresponding period ending January 14, 1915, the gross earnings were $10,410,900, showing a decrease of $3,681,500, notwithstanding the fact that from July 1, 1913, to July 1, 1914, 549·2 extra miles of track had been opened for operation, and since 1914 some 285 more miles operated. The reduced gross earnings correspond with the decreased crop movement. The return made by the Department of Trade and Commerce, Census and Statistic Branch, shows that the cereal products for the year 1914 fell off as follows:—

Manitoba	33%
Saskatchewan	43%
Alberta	22%

while the result to the producer, owing to the largely increased value of grain products, is not what the percentage would show, the railway company gets no more for handling wheat which may sell for $1.50 than it does for wheat that might sell at 75 cents. The result is that railway companies of necessity feel the falling off in production much more than the other interests of the country.

The weekly figures of the Canadian Pacific Railway Company tell the same story.

Prior to 1900, the question as to when station agents should or should not be appointed in the prairie provinces was a very vexed one. New stations were being continually opened up. The railway companies desired to operate them without the expense of agents. Local boards of trade were continually demanding that agents should be appointed. After a full investigation, the board, on the 6th of January, 1910, issued Order No. 9160, which provided among other matters, that, at all stations or shipping places from or to which the total freight and passenger earnings of the company for the last fiscal year amounted to not less than $15,000, of which $2,000 should represent inward traffic, a permanent agent should be appointed and continued, and that, at all non-agency points, where the business of the company consisted solely or principally of grain shipments, amounting to at least 50,000 bushels for the previous year, temporary grain agents should be appointed and continued during the grain shipping season, which was fixed from September 15 to December 31 in each year. These represented the minimum earnings which the board thought were necessary to be found before it could exercise its jurisdiction and compel the employment of agents in ordinary cases. It, of course, was always open to the railway companies, for purposes of competition or for the purposes of working up business, or for any other company reasons, to put in agents when such earnings were not enjoyed. None of these considerations could, however, move the board in making an order.

1. Lavoy, Alta. (C.N.R.).—The earnings at this station for the year ending December 31, 1914, amounted to $9,341. There is no operating condition which would justify the board's ordering that an agent should be continued, as there is an agent on the west at Vegreville, only 9 miles away, and on the east at Ramperly, a distance of about 9 miles away. The returns, however, show that business, although small is mixed in character, there being a fair package business both in freight and express.

Under these circumstances, while I think an order should go relieving the company of the duty of retaining an agent, a caretaker should be appointed to look after these small freight shipmnts.

2. Chandler, Sask. (C.N.R.).—The earnings at this station for the twelve months ending September, 1914, including, therefore, a period when business was good, only amounted to $5,392.83. The freight business largely consisted of the grain movement, which can be properly looked after by a grain agent. The earnings were never such as to require the appointment of an agent, who probably was appointed by the railway company owing to the fact that Midvale, a station on the Canadian Pacific line, is only 7 miles distant.

I think the order should be granted as asked.

3. Devlin, Ont. (C.N.R.)—Business at this station for the year ending November, 1914, amounted in all to $9,532. The business is of a mixed character, and I therefore think that a term of the order allowing the agent to be discontinued (although the earnings are below the required amount), must call for the appointment of a caretaker.

4. Barming, Ont. (C.N.R.)—The earnings at this station for the 12 months ending September 30, 1914, only amounted to $2,789.34. Under the board's order, no agent need have been appointed. The appointment was probably owing to competitive reasons, as Ignace, on the Canadian Pacific line, is only 10 miles distant, I think the order should go as asked.

5. Ladysmith, Man. (C.N.R.)—The earnings at this point for the year ending September 30, 1914, amounted to $3,093.60. This station is 12 miles from McGregor on the Canadian Pacific railway, and perhaps affords a reason why the agent was originally appointed. The order should go as asked.

6. Homewood, Man. (C.N.R.)—The earnings for the year ending November, 1914, amounted to $9,536.79. Although the earnings here are considerably less than those required by the board's order, there is a mixed business at this point of such a volume as to render it necessary that a caretaker should be appointed to look after the L. C. L. freight and perform other duties about the station, such as keeping it clean and warm for the arrival and departure of trains. The order should go subject to the stipulation that a caretaker be appointed.

7. Fairfax, Man. (C.N.R.)—This station has been remunerative, the earnings for the 12 months ending September 30, 1914, amounting to $18,514.28. This of itself, of course, is no reason why, in view of the drop in business, which ordinarily one would expect to effect this station as well as others, the agent should not be discontinued; but on investigating the matter closely, the receipts at this station for the months of October and November showed an actual increase of $204.77 over the corresponding months in 1913, instead of a decrease of some 30 per cent as might have been expected. The application should be dismissed.

8. Ridpath, Sask. (C.N.R.)—The earnings at this station are shown to be less than the amount required by the board's order. The station is but five miles away from Anglia on the Canadian Pacific. There is also an agent on the Canadian Northern line at Rosetown a distance of 7 miles to the east. Although the business is not such as to, under the present circumstances, demand an agent, a caretaker should be appointed as a term of the order.

9. Berton, Man. (C.N.R.)—The earnings at this point for 12 months ending September, 1914, amounted to $10,656.15. These earnings are very largely derived from grain shipments which can properly be looked after by a grain agent when required. I think the order should go allowing the application.

10. Hawick, Alta. (C.N.R.)—The earnings at this station are small and much below the amount requried. The agent probably was appointed for competitive reasons owing to the fact that Strathmore, on the Canadian Pacific line, is only 7 miles distant. An order should be made as asked.

11. Brunkild, Man. (C.N.R.).—The earnings at this station for the year ending November, 1914, amounted to $10,350.80. The station is 10½ miles away from Osborne on the Canadian Pacific line; and on the Canadian Northern line to the west there is an agent at Sparling, 9 miles distant, and to the east at Sanford, some 8 miles away. Although the business done is comparatively small, the L.C.L. movement is of such a character as to require the installation of a caretaker as a term of the order, which, I think, with that condition, should be granted.

12. Beaver, Man. (C.N.R.).—The total earnings at this station for the year ending September, 1914, amounted to $8,752.28. The greater part of this business consists of wheat shipments, which can be looked after by the grain agent. An order allowing the application should go.

13. Minburn, Alta. (C.N.R.).—The earnings for the year ending December, 1914, amounted to $15,621. The company, however, insists that the station agent should be discontinued on the ground that the later months in the period show a very large shrinkage from the previous business. For example: Earnings for October, November, and December, 1913, were $12,182, and for the same months in 1914, $6,997, or a decrease of $5,185. At a time like the present, I am not at all prepared to say that stations where more than $15,000 is being earned should have an agent, if practically the whole of the business is represented by the grain shipment, which can be satisfactorily handled by a grain agent; but in this case the figures show a relatively large local freight business. The inward freight business is relatively large, made up principally of L.C.L. shipments, and some package freight outgoing. The L.C.L. and package freight business is just that sort of business which requires the service of an agent to properly look after it. The application should be dismissed.

14. Woodnorth, Man. (C.N.R.).—A good business is being done at this point. The year's business ending November, 1914, shows a total of $17,783. The company, however, points out that, from the indications, this amount will not be earned in the current year, as the freight and passenger earnings for October and November, 1914, fell off from $6,980 to $4,501, a decrease for the two months only of $2,479. The force of this comparison, however, is lost when it is borne in mind that the lesser earnings form part of the present total of $17,783. If the annual statement is antedated and made to end, for example, on September 30, 1914, the earnings then amount to $21,457.72. Under such circumstances, the application, on the present material at any rate, must be dismissed.

15. Decker, Man. (C.N.R.).—The earnings in this case amount to $18,939.75. While the earnings are probably falling off as alleged, there is a good deal of L.C.L. express, and passenger business. The application should be dismissed.

16. Rosebank, Man. (C.N.R.).—This is a station that has made good earnings, and if the year's business was computed as ending September, 1914, sufficient earnings would still be shown, as the earnings would then amount to $16,725. This station, however, is one where the drop in business has been both material and sudden, as was the decrease in the months of September, October and November, 1914, from the business of the same three months of 1913, which was no less than $8,400, the earnings for this period in 1914 (which was ordinarily the poor period) being but $4,108 as against $12,508 for the former year. Under the circumstances, the agent may be discontinued; but a caretaker to look after the receipt of freight and L.C.L. traffic existing at this point must be appointed.

17. Underhill, Man. (C.N.R.).—The total business done at this station for the year ending December, 1914, amounted to $13,406.11. The business here is very largely grain, as of this total no less than $10,335 consisted of carload shipments out, which would be practically all grain. While the facts are as stated, the former business at this point requires the public to be convenienced by a caretaker, and a caretaker must be appointed.

18. Willmar, Sask. (C.N.R.).—The business here for the year ending November, 1914, amounted to $24,128. The company points out that there has been a decrease between the months of October and November, 1913, and October and November, 1914, of $3,451. I think the application here is premature. I have no doubt business will be somewhat less, but there is a considerable margin to come and go on. The company itself only wants to discontinue the agent until April 1, showing that it expects the business to be such as to demand the services of an agent except for the winter months. I would, therefore, dismiss the application.

19. Pinkham, Sask. (C.N.R.).—The earnings for the 12 months, ending September 30, 1914, were $21,986.28. Undoubtedly they are dropping off; but no figures have been supplied that would show that, even with the general declension of business, the application should be granted. I would, therefore, dismiss it.

20. St. Gregor, Sask. (C.N.R.).—The earnings at this station for the year ending December, 1914, amounted to $15,373, $8,803 of which was carload traffic. The station has been a good earner in the past, but the drop in business for the last three months (the poor months of the year), is somewhat large, the earnings for this period of 1913 being $12,172, while for the same period of 1914, $5,014, a decrease of $7,158. Under the circumstances, and in view of existing railway conditions in the west, I think an order may go permitting the discontinuance of the agent, but only on the understanding that a caretaker be appointed.

21. Waseca, Sask. (C.N.R.).—The earnings at this point for the year ending November, 1914, amounted to $21,745. There is a large outward earning at this station of L.C.L. Shipments with a reasonably large passenger business. The application should be dismissed.

22. Weldon, Sask. (C.N.R.).—This station has been another good earning point, the earnings for the 12 months ending September 30, 1914, being $23,560.72. No specific figures have been submitted by the company showing losses in the later months, and the percentage of general declension in business would still leave this station with sufficiently large earnings to justify the retention of an agent. I would dismiss the application. Our inspector's report shows total earnings for October, November, and December to amount to $5,244.00.

23. Sleemans, Ont. (C.N.R.).—The earnings in this case for the year ending September 30, 1914, were good. The business undoubtedly has fallen off; but while the business is dropping, the station is one of very mixed activities. Revenue is derived from shipments of cordwood, pulpwood, and cedar. In the month of September last 43 cars were shipped, and up to January 2, 101 cars. Investigation shows that there is something like 300 cars of pulpwood to be handled. Besides this, there is a fair amount of passenger business and inward freight in L.C.L. lots. An agent is necessary and the application should be dismissed.

24. Cardale, Man. (C.N.R.)—The earnings here have been good. The company itself thinks that the only period during which it could get along without an agent would be until April 1 next. Under such circumstances, the application should be dismissed.

25. Beadle, Sask. (C.N.R.)—The earnings in this case for the year ending November, 1914, were $22,931.14. The case is "on all fours" with that of Cardale. The application should be dismissed.

26. Neelin, Man. (C.N.R.).—Taking the earnings at this station for the better period, that is for the year ending September 30, 1914, the effect of which is to include in the period considered the high earning months of October, November, and December, 1913, the earnings at this station are nevertheless less than the minimum of $15,000 required in ordinary cases. There has, nevertheless, been a fair business. There is a fair amount of inward freight and also outward local freight,—quite sufficient business to demand the appointment of a caretaker. This station is but 8¾ miles away from Holmfield on the Canadian Pacific line, and the earnings for the

last year have been (if taken down to December), only $12,087.09. The order should be made subject to the appointment of a caretaker.

27. St. Laurent, Man. (C.N.R.)—So far as the earnings at this station are concerned, they are insufficient of themselves to require the retention of the agent. A large amount of the traffic is entirely local. There is also some traffic in frozen fish. The greatest difficulty in closing the station, however, is that, if the agent is taken away, the nearest point on the Canadian Northern where an agent is to be found to the west is 50 miles distant. This station is only 8 miles from Meadows on the Canadian Pacific, and it may be that an agent could be much more profitably employed at some other point on the Canadian Northern line; but as matters now stand, the application should be dismissed.

28. Warren, Man. (C.N.R.)—The earnings at this point for the year ending September 30, 1914, only amounted to $9,117.26. Although the business is not large, it is steady month in and month out. The carload movement is relatively small and the L.C.L. movement relatively large. While not large enough to justify the company being put to the expense of an agent, a caretaker should be appointed, and the order allowing the application should be on such terms.

29. Norquay, Man. (C.N.R.)—The earnings for the twelve-month period ending September 30, 1914, amounted to $21,632.30. It is true that for the period ending November of the same year they had fallen off to $18,359. The December figures, I have not on file. This is a mixed farming district, so that the grain shipments are relatively much less than at other points, business is more broken in character, and there is more work for an agent to do. In view of the fact that the business is of the character I mention, and that the next agent on the west at Priceville is 27 miles away, I think the application should be refused.

30. Mafeking, Man. (C.N.R.)—The earnings for the year ending September 30, 1914, amounted to $21,154.29. The revenue in this case does not seem to be falling off very materially, probably owing to the fact that a large part of the movement consists of frozen fish. No grain moves from this point, and the company only has three open stations at present between Swan River and Hudson Bay Junction, a distance of 103 miles. The retention of an agent at this point will work no hardship. The earnings for October, November, and December last, when the effect of the depression would be felt, amounted to $3,420.

31. D'Arcy, Sask. (C.N.R.).—Conditions seem to be reversed at this station. The earnings for the year ending September 30, 1914, amounted to $28,876.24. Instead, however, of finding a decrease on taking the 12-month period back from November of this year, that period shows on the contrary a business of $36,596.24. Not only is the business large, but there is also a large amount of L.C.L. shipments both in forwarded and received freight, and a large amount of passenger business. The application should be refused.

32. Delmas, Sask. (C.N.R.).—I do not know why this application was made. The earnings do not justify the employment of an agent under the terms of the general order and, apparently, from the board's report, no agent was appointed. The company now has a caretaker at the station who appears to be handling the business perfectly satisfactorily. As there is no agent, no order need be made on the application.

33. Brooking, Sask. (C.N.R.).—The earnings for the year, ending November, 1914, amounted to $17,012. The company points out that, in the business of the last three months, there has been a falling off of $2,113. This comparison, however, loses much force when it is remembered that the $17,000 total includes two of the poor months. From a consideration of the business and figures as submitted, it does not appear that a case has at present been made out for the removal of the agent.

34. Mikado, Sask. (C.N.R.).—The earnings at this station for the year ending September 30, 1914, amounted to $19,053.29. While the business has fallen off, as

evidenced by the fact that the business of the year, taken down to November instead of September, only amounted to $16,561.62, I nevertheless think that, from the information as to the business supplied, the application should be refused.

35. Purple Springs, Alta. (C.P.R.).—The earnings at this point for the year ending December 31, 1914, amounted to $12,186.07. There is no question but what the earnings have fallen short of the board's requirements. On the other hand, the business is sufficient to warrant the employment of a caretaker.

36. Tilley, Alta. (C.P.R.).—The earnings at this point were good; but the railway activities were largely the result of construction work on the railway's erection system. This construction has ceased and business has dropped off so materially as to render it impossible for the board to order the continuance of an agent.

37. Beverly, Sask. (C.P.R.).—The total earnings at this station for the year ending December 1, 1914, only amounted to $8,644. The falling off of business at this point has been very great, as the station at one time was a good earner. The business, which is now being carried on, is of a mixed character; and while the earnings are much below the requirements of the board's order, a caretaker should be appointed.

Assistant Chief Commissioner Scott concurred.

COMPLAINT OF THE COWICHAN RATEPAYERS' ASSOCIATION AND OTHERS AGAINST THE RATES CHARGED ON GRAIN AND MILL FEEDS FROM ALBERTA POINTS TO POINTS IN THE COWICHAN DISTRICT, B.C.

Judgment, Chief Commissioner DRAYTON, February 15, 1915:

The application was heard at the sittings of the board held June 8, 1914, at Victoria, B.C.

At the hearing the application was urged by Mr. W. Patterson, who appeared for the Cowichan Creamery Associtaion, which he stated consisted of an association of 180 farmers having their place of business at Duncan. The association are large buyers of grain, as the area of cultivated land in the locality is limited, although it is entirely agricultural.

Taking Calgary as the illustrative shipping point, the rate on imported feed to Duncan, Mr. Patterson showed to be $8 a ton, as against $7 a ton for delivery at Victoria, Ladysmith, Cassidy's Crossing and Nanaimo, and the request was made that an equal rate should be made to points on Vancouver Island between Nanaimo and Victoria. The ground on which the request is based is that as the whole length of railway between Victoria and Nanaimo is but 70 miles, that a difference of $1 a ton in that short distance is unfair.

At the time of the hearing the local rail movement was from Ladysmith to Duncan, the rate to Ladysmith being as stated $7, which included the rail haul from Alberta and the water service, the additional rate charged working out the extra dollar being 5 cents per 100 lbs. from Ladysmith to Duncan.

The Railway Company's answer to the application not being ready, opportunity was given them to file a written reply. The company's defence was filed on July 2, 1914; it is as follows:—

> "In accordance with the understanding reached at the hearing of this matter at Victoria on 8th ultimo, our traffic officials have gone into it further, and I am now in receipt of their report.
>
> "Grain from Alberta to points on the E. & N. Railway is transferred from Vancouver by barge, for which landings are provided at Esquimalt near Victoria, Ladysmith and Nanaimo. There is also direct boat service between Vancouver and Victoria and Nanaimo.
>
> "Taking Calgary as a shipping point the rates to these landing points are 35 cents per 100 lbs. (Tariff C.R.C. W-1686). The same rate applies to Cassidy's,

a point between Ladysmith and Nanaimo 6·3 miles from the former and 7·8 miles from the latter place. In view of its proximity to these landing points the rates to Cassidy's could hardly be made to exceed those to Nanaimo and Ladysmith.

"Places intermediate to Victoria and Ladysmith are subject to a rate of 40 cents per 100 lbs., the difference covering the service from the barge to the rail, the rail haul and extra incidental services.

"The distance from Calgary to Vancouver is 646·1 miles and the rate allowed by the board in its recent decision in the Western Freight Rates Case for this distance is 33½ cents per 100 lbs. Therefore the rate for the additional barge service and E. & N. haul is 6½ cents per 100 lbs. over the Vancouver rate. Of this additional rate 2½ cents is credited to the barge haul and 4 cents to the E & N. Railway.

"The mileage from Ladysmith to Duncan is 18·7 miles and to Cowichan 22·9 miles. For these distances the rates allowed by the board in its recent decision (See Volume 200, page 70) are 6 cents and 8 cents respectively, as compared with the 4 cents E. & N. proportion of the rate now in question.

"The barge landing at Nanaimo is rarely used owing to difficulties in getting cars from sea to rail level, as the intervening rails are the property of the coal company. At Ladysmith the intervening rails are also the property of the coal company, but under contract with the latter a charge of 50 cents per car has been arranged which is paid out of the E. & N. Railway proportion.

"The distance from Esquimalt to the points in question is greater than that from Ladysmith and therefore I need not deal with it.

"Under these circumstances I submit that the complaint should be dismissed.

"As directed by the board I have sent a copy of this letter to the secretary of the Cowichan Ratepayers' Association."

The reply of the Ratepayers' Association to the railway Company's submissions was received by the board on July 20. It is as follows:

"With reference to previous correspondence, I beg to inform you that I have received from the Law Department of the Canadian Pacific Railway Company a copy of a letter (No. 10459 of July 2) addressed to the Board of Railway Commissioners in connection with the complaint of my association and others against the rate charged on grain and mill feeds from inland points to points in the Cowichan district. With regard to this letter I beg to submit the following remarks for the consideration of the Railway Board.

(1) C.P.R. Letter, Paragraph No. 2:

Whereas it is stated that landings are provided at Esquimalt near Victoria, Ladysmith, and Nanaimo, for grain shipped from Alberta to points on the E. & N. Railway, the fact is established in the latter portion of the letter that practically all grain is landed by barge via Ladysmith. The reference to boat service would suggest the possibility of competition in the shipping of cars. Under present circumstances such competition is non-existent.

(2) C. P. R. Letter, Paragraph 3:

It is stated that owing to the proximity of Cassidy's to Ladysmith and Nanaimo, the rates to Cassidy's could hardly be made to exceed those to the latter two points. I would point out that while Cassidy's is an inland point, the 40-cent rate is made to apply to Chemainus which is precisely the same distance from Ladysmith and is moreover a port with water connection.

(3) C.P.R. Letter, Paragraph 4:

Justification for the extra 5 cents is claimed in respect to services from barge to rail and rail haul. It is admitted in the latter portion of the C.P.R.'s

letter that the barge landing at Nanaimo is rarely used, and it is difficult to see why the charge for these services is applied to cars destined for Chemainus and Duncan distanced, respectively 6·3 and 18·7 miles from the landing point at Ladysmith, but is not applied in the case of cars destined for Nanaimo, Cassidy's and Victoria, distanced respectively 14·1, 6·3 and 59 miles from the same landing point.

Duncans, which is the centre of a large agricultural community and is served entirely by the E. & W. Railway, is the distributing point for the whole district covered by your petitioners, and consumes more cars of wheat and feed stuffs than any other centre on the island with the exception of Victoria.

Grain delivered at all points between Ladysmith and Victoria (59 miles) is surcharged $1 per ton over the rate applicable at Victoria and equally applicable at those points on the 14 mile haul Ladysmith to Nanaimo.

Your petitioners therefore submit that an unfair discrimination is shown in that the merchants located in the first named area are handicapped in the selling of grain, and that the farmers and consumers of feed stuffs are consequently subjected to an unfair increase of cost in production compared with their neighbours who are within touch of the points referred to.

Your petitioners respectfully submit that irrespective of questions affecting rates fixed by the board our claim for the removal of such an anomaly is well founded and we trust that the board will give it the fullest consideration."

The question has been held by the board under advisement for some considerable time with the view of working out, if possible, some rate basis which might assist the applicants and be fair to the carrier.

However, on going into the question from every possible standpoint the case is not one in which any relief can be granted. The underlying principle which affects the whole rate structure of the island is that of water competition. The movement from Vancouver to Ladysmith or Esquimalt is one of the most strongly competitive in the Dominion. The distance to Ladysmith is 48½ statute miles. The authorized maximum rate for water competition is 11 cents. The local competitive rate is 10 cents exclusive of marine insurance, and the arbitrary from Vancouver added on this through traffic from Vancouver to Ladysmith is only 2½ cents, including marine insurance. In the benefit of this reduced cost the complainants, with all other consigneees on the island, participate.

The service from Vancouver to Ladysmith consists of ferrying the cars themselves, and is comparable with the similar service within the limits of New York harbour, where, although the tonnage moved very greatly exceeds the movement in question, the ordinary rate is 3 cents; and may also be compared with the ferry operated by the Government across the Straits of Canso, a distance of approximately one mile, with a charge of 1½ cents. There can, therefore, be no question but that the arbitrary water rate to Ladysmith is reasonable. On the island the rail haul from Ladysmith to Duncan is 19 miles, to Cowichan 23 miles. It is impossible to say that this added service should be done for nothing, or that a 5-cent rate is excessive; on the other hand it is reasonable, and is in fact, a lower rate than many other rates which are to-day in effect and which could be easily illustrated. This 5-cent rate is a flat rate and is not based upon mileage, with the result that the consignee at Duncan pays the same rate as the consignee at Cowichan and at other points along the 70-mile stretch referred to by Mr. Patterson, but the reason for the blanketing of the rate is obvious; Ladysmith is not the only port available, traffic can just as well be barged to Esquimalt, and as a matter of fact there are other ports which could be made available. It should also be noted that traffic to-day is barged to Esquimalt. This owing to the fact that both the "gridiron" and the connecting spur at Ladysmith belong to the Canadian Northern or affiliated interests. Under the application of a

strict mileage basis Duncan is somewhat farther from Esquimalt than it is from Ladysmith but the blanket rate of 5 cents, however, properly covers the situation.

The earnings of the railway on the island are low. Traffic fell off 45 per cent last March, 30 per cent in April, and 50 per cent in May. As matters now stand it is doubtful whether any adequate return is being earned by the carrier, so that no reduction can be made unless that reduction is necessary on the grounds of discrimination.

On the question of discrimination, Chemainus, which is cited as a point taking a $7 rate, is a port, and shipments could easily be made to it by water. If, as a matter of fact, the $7 rate applies to any point which is not on the water front with real or potential facilities (and with the exception of the unimportant Cassidy's crossing so far I have discovered none), so that there may be no discrimination between such a point and Duncan, addition should be made in the rate to bring it up to the rate charged to Duncan.

While the matter was still under consideration another complaint was made by the Cowichan Creamery Association by letter of December 29, received January 6 last. The association pointed out that the former rate on eggs to Victoria of 21 cents had been raised to 28 cents per 100 lbs. (reduced to 27 cents as in excess of the amount chargeable from Nanaimo to Victoria); and hay (L.C.L.) to Victoria 22 cents per 100 lbs., while the rate from Victoria to Duncan was 18 cents. This complaint has been taken up with the railway company, and after full investigation I am of the view that the increases made effective September 1, 1914, were not justified, and must be reduced, and further, that proper tariffs must issue to correct anomalies now existing as exemplified by the rates on produce in and out of Duncan. Intimation has already been given the railway company that these changes must be made, and as I understand a corrected tariff is being prepared no order need issue to-day. However, an order will issue unless these anomalies are removed at an early date.

Commissioner Goodeve concurred.

APPLICATION OF RIGHT REVEREND E. GROUARD, O.M.I., D.D., VICARIATE OF ATHABASCA, AND ASSISTANT VICARIATES OF ATHABASCA AND MCKENZIE, FOR AN ORDER DIRECTING THE RAILWAY COMPANIES TO GIVE THEM SETTLERS' RATES ON THEIR SHIPMENTS FROM EASTERN CANADA.

Judgment Chief Commissioner DRAYTON, February 16, 1915:

It is not very many years ago since the jobbers and wholesalers of westerly distributing points objected to the fact that settlers were in the habit of getting in new goods and general supplies at the special rates given by the railway company for the *bona fide* second-hand effects of the settler from the east.

The position taken by the jobber was that, under the guise of the settlers' effects rates, new goods were being brought into the country entering into competition with the jobbers and wholesalers at a freight rate less than they themselves could enjoy; and that, as a result, the different towns of Western Canada, which were entitled to a certain area of distribution, were being deprived of their rights. As a result, the present classification as to settlers' effects is strictly enforced.

General goods cannot be carried; but the rate only applies to the actual possessions of persons moving from the east to the west with a view of living there to the extent that the exceptional rate applies as set out in Mr. Hardwell's report.

It would seem to me that missionaries leaving the east with a view of *bona fide* settling in the west, as the petition shows, fall within the general description of settlers, and would be entitled to take second-hand household goods and personal effects, and second-hand implements and farm vehicles, livestock, and, generally, all the different articles which the *bona fide* settler gets a special rate on, as contained in Mr. Hardwell's report.

This, apparently, does not go as far as the petitions of the Reverend Fathers Falher and Lefebvre, bursars for the vicariates of Athabasca and MeKenzie, require. They, apparently, are desirous of getting in each year their new supplies, provisions, agricultural implements, etc., under the settlers' rate. This is something no settler is entitled to do and is not covered by any existing tariff.

The case, therefore, is not one in which the board can make an order, notwithstanding the excellent objects of the institutions, which are entirely eleemosynary.

Deputy Chief Commissioner Nantel concurred.

COMPLAINTS OF THE BOARD OF TRADE, PICTON, ONTARIO, AND THE COUNTY OF PRINCE EDWARD, ONTARIO, RE TRAIN AND MAIL SERVICE ON THE LINE OF THE CANADIAN NORTHERN ONTARIO RAILWAY.

Judgment Chief Commissioner DRAYTON, February 19, 1915:

A resolution was passed by the County Council of the County of Prince Edward protesting against changes which the Canadian Northern Ontario Railway Company had made in its running timetable. The matter has been investigated and can now be dealt with.

The Canadian Northern, by its timetable effective December 14, 1914, started its morning train No. 12 out of Toronto at 10.20 a.m. instead of 8.20 a.m. The train, therefore, does not reach Trenton until 1.30 p.m. instead of 11.30 a.m. as formerly.

The connection that the county council is interested in is the Picton connection, operated by the same railway company. The former train left Trenton for Picton at 11.55 a.m. In view of the changed time of the Toronto train, the train now leaves at 1.35 p.m., or one hour and forty-five minutes later.

The morning mail is carried on the Grand Trunk train from the west arriving on train at 10.46 a.m. It was formerly taken to Picton on the 11.55 a.m. train, but now, of course, has to be taken by the later train leaving at 1.35 p.m. Under the old train service, the morning mail would arrive at 1.05 p.m., and now arrives at 2.45 p.m., or one hour and forty minutes later. It does not appear, however, that the more important mail service is interfered with at all. The heavy mail would appear to be carried on the Grand Trunk night train arriving in Trenton at midnight. The night mail from the east arrives at Trenton at 2.34 a.m.; and the train of the Canadian Northern leaving at 7.20 a.m., arriving at Picton at 8.30 a.m., therefore provides for mail arriving from both the east and west. There may, of course, be mail from some points picked up on the morning train, and although relatively unimportant to the larger movement, the company has been asked to justify why the change has been made.

The company points out that the Canadian Pacific runs morning trains out of Toronto at 9 and 9.20, and the Grand Trunk at 9 o'clock; and that, running a train on their line at 10.20 instead of 8.20 is a convenience to the travelling public, as it enables a connection to be made at the East Don with a train from the north (from Orillia and other intermediate points), and in addition enables passengers arriving in Toronto on the Grand Trunk 10.05 train to proceed east without delay.

Under all the circumstances, public convenience does not demand an order restoring the former timetable.

Assistant Chief Commissioner Scott and Commissioner McLean concurred.

NAPANEE AND DESERONTO TRAIN SERVICE.

Judgment, Chief Commissioner DRAYTON, February 19, 1915:

A complaint was made by the Deseronto Board of Trade in March, 1914, that the Bay of Quinte Railway (a railway now controlled by the Canadian Northern

Railway Company, and hereinafter referred to as "the Canadian Northern"), discontinued its connection with the Grand Trunk night express from east and west at Napanee, causing inconvenience to the travelling public and delays to mails and express. This connection was one of some thirty years' standing.

The board immediately took up the question with the railway company. The company showed that, on an average, the trains in question carried but two or three passengers; and that, owing to the additional fact that the Canadian Northern was running a through train service itself from Toronto, the company was amply justified in discontinuing the service.

The board directed that the service should be reinstated until the whole question could be looked into and consideration given to the effect of the change which would be brought about in the local situation by the completion and operation of the Canadian Northern line from Toronto to Ottawa.

In October, 1914, the Canadian Northern Railway Company's Ottawa-Toronto line being in operation, the particular connection in question with the Grand Trunk was stopped, the Canadian Northern naturally desiring to obtain the benefit of whatever through business there might be.

A complaint was then made by the town of Deseronto, stating that:—

> "Until about a year ago, the service performed by the Canadian Northern Railway was satisfactory; but since then it has not been so satisfactory, and on Monday last a new timetable was put in effect completely cutting us off from Grand Trunk connections unless by waiting at Napanee for some hours, except in two cases, when, if the trains are on time, a connection is made."

The complaint also pointed out that, in giving this service, the railway company had acted under the agreement made with the municipality, and a copy of the agreement was forwarded.

The agreement in question is dated December 19, 1881, and is between the Bay of Quinte Railway Company and the village of Deseronto (now the town of Deseronto).

Under the agreement, the railway company was to operate the railway for the carriage of passengers and freight between the Grand Trunk Railway of Canada and the village of Deseronto as fully and effectually as the business in and out of Deseronto, in the judgment of the railway company, would warrant or sustain; and that no greater rate than 25 cents should be charged any passenger each way over the railway.

The agreement seems to be entirely against the municipality instead of one applying for its benefit. The whole effect of it seems to be that the service is merely to be that kind of service which, in the judgment of the railway company, is warranted; so that the whole question of service is left in the hands of the railway company. The question, however, should not be so considered at all, but should be considered merely from the standpoint as to what service, having regard to the demands of traffic, the railway company, in the public interest, should be called upon by this board to maintain.

The question of railway connection was investigated by an officer of the board, from whose investigation it is apparent that connections at Napanee between the Canadian Northern train No. 12 and the Grand Trunk train No. 14 had been frequently missed. So as to improve the service and connection, the Canadian Northern undertook that its train No. 12 should arrive at Napanee at 12.35 p.m. instead of 12.40. The Grand Trunk train No. 14 being due to arrive at Napanee at 12.46 p.m. It was thought this would afford ample time in which to make the transfer. The connection, however, even under the new arrangement, not being entirely satisfactory (and sometimes missed), under the later timetable, the Canadian Northern train now arrives at Napanee at 11.20 a.m. This is a decided improvement on the

service, as it enables connection to be made not only with the Grand Trunk express, but also with the Grand Trunk local leaving Napanee at 11.49.

The railway company also undertook that eastbound train No. 74 would make connections at Napanee with Grand Trunk eastbound No. 32. The effect of this was to give the people from Deseronto a local train service on the Grand Trunk as far east as Brockville, and afforded them a connection which previously did not exist.

A copy of the report was sent the complainants, who subsequently advised the board that the Canadian Northern had made the situation worse than ever by cutting off entirely the train leaving Deseronto (for Toronto), about 6 a.m., and the train arriving at Deseronto (from Toronto), at about 9.30 p.m. with the result that the town was left with only two trains going west on the main line, one at 3.10 a.m., which was frequently useless, and the other at 4.40 in the afternoon; and only two trains going east, one at 12.25 p.m., and the other at 3.10 a.m.

The case was set down for hearing at the sitting of the board held in Toronto on the 11th of December, 1914.

At the hearing, the position taken by the Company was that the service given was everything that traffic could possibly demand, and as a matter of fact was a much better service than the old Bay of Quinte had ever given Napanee or Deseronto, owing to the fact of the eastern and western connections given by the Canadian Northern to Toronto and Ottawa.

The company also showed, in so far as the Grand Trunk connection for Montreal was concerned, which was a connection particularly insisted upon by the town that, the Canadian Northern train leaving Deseronto at 7.15 in the morning arrived at Napanee at 7.35. The first Grand Trunk train leaving this point for the east is the local for Kingston, Gananoque, and Brockville, which leaves eight minutes after, or at 7.43 a.m., the next train being the day express to Montreal, is scheduled to leave Napanee at 12.46 p.m. This same train would also make connections, although not very satisfactory, with Grand Trunk westerly points as the Grand Trunk local train for Toronto leaves Napanee at 10.27 a.m. The next train that the company relied on as giving efficient service was their 11.05 a.m. train arriving at Napanee at 11.20, which has been already referred to. The next train to Napanee leaves Deseronto at 2.30 p.m. arriving at Napanee at 2.45 p.m. This train does not seem to serve any Grand Trunk connection. The fourth and last train leaves Deseronto at 3.10 in the morning, arriving in Napanee at 3.25. This, again, does not make any Grand Trunk connection, and is the night train for Ottawa.

At the hearing, the municipality had not a schedule prepared which they would like adopted, but stated that they were most anxious to have a train leaving Deseronto in the evening about six and arriving about eight, so that people coming in from the west, leaving Toronto at two, and those coming from Brockville and the east could make close connections with Deseronto.

No estimate at all was given as to the number of people likely to be accommodated; but, on the other hand, the railway company claimed that the earnings of some of the trains were as low as eight cents per train mile.

Judgment was reserved for the purpose of considering the train schedule and of checking the earnings.

The chief operating officer of the board, who checked the train receipts, now reports that, when the transfer trains were run between Deseronto and Napanee, the train making the midnight trip earned 8 cents per mile on an average for the period of nine months from September, 1913, to May, 1914; and the train making the evening trips earned 17 cents and 15 cents per train mile. These earnings, of course, are abnormally low; but while they represent the whole of the passenger earnings, undoubtedly earnings were obtained from freight handled on the same train by the company. The operating officer, however, further reports that, for some time past, there has not been sufficient business to warrant a freight movement between Deseronto

and Napanee, and that the passenger traffic has dropped off to a very small amount.

The actual cost of giving a passenger service between Deseronto and Napanee would approximate 80 cents per train mile, not including any allowance for overhead charges.

Under the circumstances, it is impossible to make any order, but although the business has dropped off very materially, and the earnings are extremely low, the present service must not be further reduced.

Commissioner McLean concurred.

APPLICATION OF THE CANADIAN PACIFIC RAILWAY COMPANY TO CARRY TWO ADDITIONAL TRACKS ACROSS GREENE AVENUE, IN THE CITY OF WESTMOUNT.

Judgment Assistant Chief Commissioner Scott, February 19, 1915:

The Canadian Pacific Railway Company has two tracks leading to its Windsor street station, which are carried over Greene avenue by a bridge. To increase its facilities the company desires to lay two more tracks; one each side of the existing tracks. Where the tracks cross Greene avenue the distance will be 13 feet from the centre of the existing northerly track to the centre of the new track which the company desires to construct on the north.

Prospect street parallels the railway and runs into Greene avenue at right angles just north of the railway company's bridge over Greene avenue.

The two new tracks which the company desires to construct will be laid upon its own property, with the exception of a small triangular piece of land at the southeast corner of Greene avenue and Prospect street. This strip of land at its widest point is 12 feet, and its length from Greene avenue to where it runs out at the company's property is 86 feet 9 inches. The triangular piece of property which the company desires to acquire is not a part of Prospect street, but it is a portion of a flower bed dedicated for park purposes and now owned by the city of Westmount. On the other side of Prospect street from the Canadian Pacific Railway property and the flower bed, a distance of about 100 feet from the northeast corner of Greene avenue and Prospect street, is the residence of Mr. Mann. He protested very strongly to the board that the granting of the railway company's application would be the cause of much damage to his property. A similar position was taken by the owners of the two residences immediately adjoining Mr. Mann's property on the east.

Counsel who appeared for the land owners contended that under section 235 of the Railway Act as amended by section 6 of chapter 22 of the Statutes of 1911, the board had power to make it a condition of the granting of the railway company's application that it should compensate the land owners for the damage they will suffer by having an additional track 13 feet nearer their property than the nearest existing track. The language of the section in question, as amended, reads as follows:—

> "Subject to the company making such compensation to adjacent or abutting land owners as the board deems proper the railway of the company may be carried upon along or across an existing highway, upon leave therefor having been first obtained from the board, etc."

In addition to hearing the evidence and argument at the sittings of the board in Montreal, I visited the property in question and examined the proposed location of the new track on the ground. The new tracks will not be carried along Prospect street at all. The damage which the land owners claim they will suffer will they say be from smoke, noise, and vibration from trains on the new track on the railway company's property on the opposite side of Prospect street. This may, or may not, be a cause of damage to the land owners. If it is a cause of damage, it is not such damage

as this board has power to redress. If the railway ran along Prospect street and used part of the street as its railway, the objector's claim would of course be much stronger.

In Fort William the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway Company applied to the board to be allowed to carry its tracks along Hardisty street in that city for several blocks. The tracks were to be put right on the highway and their existence would interfere with vehicular traffic on the street. In that case the board granted the application, on condition that compensation for damages sustained by reason of the location of the railway along the street, be paid by the railway company. (Order 16589; May 20, 1912; File 1519.) But the present case is different. The railway will not be carried upon or along Prospect street at all. That street is untouched by the railway. It cannot be said that the taking of the small triangular piece off the flower bed—which is not a part of Prospect street—could be construed as the carrying of the railway upon or along Prospect street.

The railway crosses Greene avenue overhead. The additional tracks will be on practically the same grade as the existing tracks. Greene avenue is not injured and is unchanged, except for a slight variation in its grade, which is unimportant. The crossing of Greene avenue by the new tracks will be more than 100 feet away from Mr. Mann's residence. The new track will be closer than that to Mr. Mann's house where it is on the Canadian Pacific Railway property across Prospect street. Under these circumstances, I do not think the board would be justified in ordering compensation to the land owners objecting.

It is undoubtedly, in the public interest to permit the railway company to provide the additional trackage as an entrance to its Windsor street station, and I therefore think the application of the railway should be granted.

Deputy Chief Commissioner Nantel and Commissioner McLean concurred.

COMPLAINT OF W. S. BILTON, OF NEWBORO, ONTARIO, AGAINST EXCESSIVE FREIGHT CHARGES ON A CAR OF COAL SHIPPED FROM OGDENSBURG, N.Y., TO NEWBORO, ONTARIO, VIA FERRY AT PRESCOTT.

Judgment, Chief Commissioner DRAYTON, February 20, 1915:—

This complaint is made by Mr. W. S. Bilton of Newboro, Ont., against the rates on coal from Ogdensburg, New York, to Newboro, Ont.

Coal moves by ferry from Ogdensburg, N.Y., to Prescott. It is there switched to the Grand Trunk connection and carried by the Grand Trunk to Lyn, a distance of sixteen miles. From Lyn to Newboro the movement is over the Canadian Northern, a distance of 35 miles.

No joint rate to cover this traffic has ever been filed by the railway companies.

The ferry appears to be operated by the Prescott and Ogdensburg Ferry Company, Limited. It has been said that the ferry is really a Canadian Pacific property, and that it is operated by that company; but this is denied by the Canadian Pacific.

In any event, not much objection can be taken to its rate, which was stated at the hearing to be about 18 cents—being actually more like 20 cents—per gross ton. The 20-cent rate for ferriage, amounting, as it does, to about nine-tenths of a cent per 100, compares very favourably with the charge of the government ferry across the Strait of Canso, which is 1½ cents per 100 pounds; so it would not appear reasonable to disturb this rate.

It was stated at the hearing that the Grand Trunk absorbed the interswitching charge from the ferry to its track at Prescott; and the Grand Trunk's rate, as shown by its special mileage coal tariff for this distance, is 60 cents. That company, however, recognizing that the movement is a through movement, has reduced its rate to 56 cents per gross ton. At the 60-cent rate per net ton, the ordinary charge per gross

ton would be 67¼ cents; and the reduction of 11¼ cents, as the Grand Trunk's contribution to the through rate, seems fair and reasonable.

The Canadian Northern special mileage coal tariff is identical with that of the Grand Trunk; and on this mileage tariff, the Canadian Northern has been charging 80 cents per net ton, making no reduction in view of the through movement.

I am of the opinion that an order should be made directing the companies to agree upon and file a joint tariff to apply on coal from Prescott to all points on that portion of the Canadian Northern line formerly known as the Brockville, Westport, and Sault Ste. Marie Railway. The Grand Trunk's proportion of this joint tariff may reasonably be left as it is; and corresponding reductions must be made by the Canadian Northern in its local tariffs, so as to provide proper through rates, having regard to mileage in each case.

Deputy Chief Commissioner Nantel and Commissioners McLean and Goodeve concurred.

COMPLAINT OF FERNIE-FORT STEELE BREWING COMPANY OF FERNIE, B.C., RE HEATED CAR SERVICE SUPPLIED BY THE CANADIAN PACIFIC RAILWAY COMPANY.

Judgment, Chief Commissioner Drayton, February 20, 1915:

This complaint is made by the Fernie-Fort Steele Brewing Company, of Fernie B.C., and refers to the heated car service supplied by the Canadian Pacific Railway Company.

The question is an old one, this same company having made a similar complaint in December of 1913. The board then took the question up with the railway company, with the result that an arrangement was made between the parties and the complaint was withdrawn by letter of January 7, 1914.

Similar complaint was made about the same time by the Elk Valley Brewing Company of Michel, B.C., which was also withdrawn.

Complaint was renewed by the Fernie-Fort Steele Brewing Company this winter, and was made as a result of the Canadian Pacific Railway Company's car service circular No. 16, addressed to agents, yardmasters, conductors, shippers aud consignees, page 3, paragraph 1, section (*f*), of which states that "No heated cars will be loaded or operated when outside temperature is zero or lower or during stormy weather." The applicants complained that this rule would "practically" stop their business in the winter months, especially in "the Prairie provinces, where the weather was liable to be below zero for weeks at a time."

Under the company's car service circular No. 12, dated November 10, 1913, and similarly addressed, station agents and others were advised under paragraph 1, section (*f*), that no heated cars would be loaded or operated when outside temperatures were 10 below zero or lower or during stormy weather. The heated car service referred to in this circular was one which the company held out as available up to December 31, 1913.

It will be observed that the circular which is the immediate cause of the present complaint changes the former regulation, instructions being that heated cars will not be loaded or operated when the temperature is zero or lower.

Section No. 2 of the last circular is as follows:—

> "Shippers are requested not to offer for furtherance such freight as beer, fruit, etc., which is liable to be easily damaged by frost during extremely cold or stormy weather when the temperature is such that it precludes the possibility of goods arriving at destination in good condition. Should there be any doubt as to the operation of schedule during such weather, shippers should telephone local freight agent for information as to whether the shipments will be accepted.

"Agents must suspend loading of heated line cars when outside temperature is zero or lower. Extremely cold or stormy weather interferes with the operation of train service and increases the hazard of delay in transit."

The service is again limited to the 31st of December, with the same exception as is contained in the former circular applying to shipments of 12,000 pounds or over offered for forwarding to points between two consecutive divisional points, as for example, between Winnipeg and Brandon, or between Brandon and Broadview.

As the circular filed, bearing tariff No. W. 3302, provides for this heated refrigerator car service entirely at owner's risk, and in view of the provisions of the bill of lading and the freight classification, I was unable to understand why there should be any limitation as to temperature or as to time, and the matter has been taken up with the company.

The company's position is that the traffic is one which they do not desire, and that the reason why the limited service was put in was to accommodate Christmas holiday trade, and they further point out that the courts have not given full effect to the owner's risk clause, but on the other hand have thrown upon the company the onus of showing that the cars were kept properly heated, not only at the time of loading but in transit, and while unloading takes place. Statistics were asked for which would illustrate the results of the traffic, bearing in mind the manner in which local courts, administering petty court jurisdiction have dealt with the question of the company's liability.

The results show that the Canadian Pacific Railway Company received a revenue of $1,171.89, but have paid out on claims for damage by frost no less than $2,134.52 for the season. The question is, of course, confined to the L.C.L. movement. This movement means that the car may have to be opened at different stations "en route" for the purpose of delivering portions of its load. The railway company says that with the low temperature obtaining it is impossible to open the car from time to time and avoid freezing beer and other perishable commodities. The results of the business would seem to entirely justify the position which the company takes. On the other hand, if shippers want to take the chance and are desirous of making shipments, I do not see why they should not be allowed to do so, and why effect should not be given to the terms of the bills of lading. It seems to me to be manifestly in the interests of the shippers that they should be entitled to do business if they desire to take the chances; and so as to provide for the traffic I am of the opinion that the company should be obliged to accept shipments of the kind in question, subject to the stipulation that the shipper must sign a release waiving all claim for frost damages unless he can first prove that the heating appliances which the cars are supposed to be supplied with were in fact missing. The release should also contain a further exception which will cover the case of damage by frost occurring by reason of fires in the heaters going out as a result of the negligence of any of the employees of the railway company; but the damages recoverable in such instances should be limited to one-half the sum of the freight tolls charged on the shipment in question. I would limit the damages in this way by reason of the actual experience of the company in regard to the manner in which the courts have construed the "owner's risk" provisions of the bill of lading and freight classification. The provision suggested does not provide for any proper damages to the shipper but as already pointed out, the railway companies do not want the traffic, state that it is impossible to safely carry it, and that the damages result from causes which it is impossible to control. It is quite clear that weather conditions often make it impossible to eliminate damage, a condition which seems to have been entirely overlooked in the manner in which claims against the company have been dealt with by the courts. It would be entirely unfair to put the company in the position of insuring against loss, and the only reason I adopt the further exception to the release is that some incentive should be thrown upon the company to observe all due

diligence in protecting the shipments against frost. The possibility of loss of one-half of the earnings on the traffic should be sufficient to insure that the carrier will do whatever he can do to reduce frost losses as much as possible. It is impossible to compel the railway to accept business of this class, and at the same time to protect the shipper to a greater extent.

The regulations and practices which this judgment will make effective are novel and may be regarded as experimental.

The complaints as to the service in question are practically confined to the Fernie-Fort Steel Brewing Company and the Elk Valley Brewing Company. I would, therefore, limit any order which may be issued carrying this judgment into effect to shipments of these companies and any others that may apply for the same service during the next winter season, at the close of which the practical utility or uselessness of the service will have been demonstrated one way or the other.

Assistant Chief Commissioner Scott and Commissioner Goodeve concurred.

PAVING OF SYNDICATE AVENUE SUBWAY, FORT WILLIAM, ONT.

Judgment, Assistant Chief Commissioner SCOTT, February 22, 1915:—

The Canadian Pacific Railway Company applies to the board for an order directing the city of Fort William to pave the subway known as Syndicate Avenue Subway, which affords a means of access from Syndicate avenue to the water front at Fort William.

There has not been a hearing before the board in this matter; but as both parties have put in a submission in writing, and as the facts are not in dispute, I think the matter is now ripe for judgment.

The subway was built by the railway company pursuant to an agreement made between the company and the city, dated June 28, 1911. Clause 1 of the agreement reads as follows:—

> "1. The company will within two years from the date hereof, subject to the approval of the Board of Railway Commissioners for Canada, construct, complete and maintain (except as to the pavement thereof and drainage therefor, which are to be made and provided by the city), a subway suitable for pedestrian and vehicular traffic under the company's tracks at a point between the productions easterly of the south limit of Ridgeway street and of the face of the northeasterly wall of the company's Fort William Union passenger station, and upon the completion of the said subway (including the work to be performed by the city as herein provided) will dedicate the roadway and footway therein as a public highway and will provide and dedicate for public highway purposes strips of land of the width of the said subway as follows:—
>
> "(*a*) Extending from Syndicate avenue or Ridgeway street to the northeasterly end of the said subway; and (*b*) extending from the southeasterly end of the said subway to a line drawn at right angles to the said subway and approximately fifty feet distant from the water's edge of the Kaministiquia river; and (*c*) from the last mentioned strip southwesterly to the limits of property owned by the company opposite the end of the street or highway known as Front street; the said three strips of land with the roadway and footway of the subway to form one continuous highway from Syndicate avenue or Ridgeway street to Front street, and which continuous highway is hereinafter referred to as the 'substituted highway.' The city shall provide and construct the drainage and pavement for the said substituted highway, including the portion thereof comprising the roadway and footway in the said subway, and shall thereafter maintain the said substituted highway as part of its streets.

And the company shall at all times have the right to construct, maintain and operate its railway and tracks, including any additional tracks which may hereafter be required, over such subway and highway thereunder so established. The said subway shall be not less than forty and not more than fifty feet in width and with a headway of not less than 10 and not more than 11 feet under the tracks, and shall, in other particulars, subject to the approval of the said board, be in accordance with such plans and specifications as the company may determine."

The plans of the proposed subway were approved of by Order No. 16990, dated July 8, 1912.

By letter, dated August 29, 1912, the board was notified by the railway company that the subway would shortly be ready for paving, but that the city had made no preparations for doing the work, and that it stated that it did not propose to do anything until it received a deed of the right of way. That letter was brought to the attention of the city, and by letter dated September 26, 1912, signed by the city clerk, the board was notified that the city council at a meeting held on September 24 had passed the following resolution:—

"That the solicitor and city engineer be instructed to take such steps as are necessary to carry out the agreement of the Canadian Pacific Railway respecting Syndicate avenue subway, and report back to council as soon as possible."

In that letter we also advised:—

"It is the intention of council to get a report as to the nature of the paving and the actual cost, and the solicitor will draw the necessary by-law for the raising of money necessary to carry out the work."

Upon the board inquiring of the municipality what progress had been made towards the paving of the subway, the city clerk wrote the secretary on May 29, 1913, as follows:—

"I may state in reply that our present engineer has prepared plans and specifications for the paving of this subway, and we hope shortly to be able to call for tenders for the construction of the work.

"The work has been held up until this late date on account of the Canadian Pacific railway not being ready for us to go ahead."

By letter, dated July 4, 1914, His Worship the Mayor wrote the Chief Commissioner as follows:—

"The city council of 1912 entered into an agreement with the Canadian Pacific Railway Company to pave the subway from Syndicate avenue to the river frontage near the Union depot.

"The subway is completed and we find ourselves in the unfortunate position that we cannot carry out our part of the agreement as we have no means of issuing debentures to cover this work. At the time the railway company petitioned your board for permission to build the subway you were not asked to consider the apportioning of the cost.

"Will you kindly advise whether it would be possible for your board to order the city to pave the subway as their portion of the entire work. If this is possible I will be glad to send resolution of council giving the consent of the city to carry out this work.

"Trusting to have favourable reply."

To that letter the following reply was sent:—

"I have your letter of the 4th instant.

"The file I find is in the West with our engineer.

"It seems to me, however, that if the town has agreed to pave the subway, and has no objection to an order being made implementing its agreement so as to avoid the cost of submitting a by-law to the ratepayers, no one could raise any objection to the order."

On an application from the railway company for permission to open the subway for traffic, the board's engineer, Mr. Drury, in a report dated July 10, 1914, reports in part as follows:—

"I found that the work so far as the railway company was concerned has been constructed according to plan and is in good order.

"I would, therefore, recommend that the railway company be allowed to use and operate the subway for the carriage of traffic.

"However, on inspection of the subway I found that the city had not paved the subway, which, as I understand it, they should do according to agreement. This, however, does not prevent the railway company from using the bridge for the carriage of traffic.

"I took the matter up with Mr. Knight as to the paving (Mr. Knight being the city engineer), and he intimated that the city would be pleased to secure an order from the board directing the city to proceed with the work of paving the subway, as in order for the city to proceed with the work it would be necessary for them to get a mandate from the people or secure an order from the board.

"I might say that foot passengers use the subway at present as the sidewalk which is constructed of concrete is some feet higher than that of the driveway."

The board by Order No. 22259 of the 23rd of July, 1914, authorized the railway company to use and operate the bridge which carried its railway over the subway in question.

At a sitting of the board in Fort William, on December 16 last, we heard the application of the Fort William Board of Trade for better facilities for local freight at Fort William. On that day we visited the Canadian Pacific Railway freight shed on the water front and the subway in question. It is quite apparent that much improved freight facilities than those now enjoyed could be afforded Fort William if the subway was paved so as to provide vehicular access to the western end of the freight shed.

In its answer to this application Fort William contends that the agreement was one which the council had no authority to make without the approval of the ratepayers under the provisions of the Municipal Act. This agreement, it is stated, was submitted to the ratepayers at the last municipal election when the same was not confirmed; the vote being 715 for and 888 against confirmation of the agreement. The city submits therefore, that it is not bound by the agreement.

It is also submitted by the city that as the subway was not erected on a highway, but solely on the property of the railway company, that the board has no jurisdiction to order the city to pay any of the cost thereof.

As far as the agreement is concerned, while it may not be legally binding on the municipality, it is not necessary that there should be any agreement to give this board authority to make the order applied for.

With regard to the point taken by the city that, as this subway was not built on a city street that it is not a highway, and that therefore the board has no power to order the city to pay a portion of the cost: I would like to point out that while there

may not have been a street on the exact line of the subway there has been a dedication to the public of a highway through the subway by the railway company and an acceptance of it by the municipality. The dedication and acceptance are, in my opinion, clearly evidenced by the agreement. While because of the strict requirements of the Municipal Act the city may not be in a position to be compelled by legal proceedings to carry out its agreeemnt to pave the subway in an action by the C.P.R. in the courts of the province, the agreement may certainly be taken as an acceptance by the municipality of a highway through the subway. In addition to this the highway through the subway may be taken to be a diversion authorized by the board of an existing way of communication from Syndicate avenue to the water front. This way of communication was a bridge to convey pedestrian travel across the property of the railway company from a point on the north side of the tracks to the water front. This bridge was some distance east of the present subway. After an accident happened in connection with the bridge, Mr. Drury, the board's assistant engineer, reported on it on January 19, 1911, as follows:—

> "I am of the opinion that owing to the dangerous condition of this bridge to the employees of the railway; also to the foot passengers using this bridge that the Canadian Pacific Railway Company should be asked to remove the overhead bridge and construct by May 15, 1911, an overhead bridge at or near the same point. The bridge to have sufficient side clearance from the rail of the upright supports. Also the bridge to have the required overhead clearance; or, if the company so desire, to construct a foot passenger subway at or near the point of the present overhead bridge."

Upon that report being brought to the attention of the railway company, Mr. Beatty in a letter dated March 7, 1911, stated:—

> "We have no objection to taking down this bridge in accordance with Mr. Drury's recommendation as soon as the subway which we propose to build slightly east of our new station building at Fort William is completed."
>
> "Such a subway will render unnecessary any overhead bridge or subway on the site of the present overhead bridge."

Subsequent to that, the agreement with Fort William was made, the present subway constructed, and the old bridge taken down.

Under these circumstances, I come to the conclusion that the way through the subway is a public highway; and, that under the Railway Act this board has power to order the city of Fort William to contribute to the cost of the subway.

It is in the interests of the safety and convenience of the public that this subway should be completed, and I have no hesitation in saying that I think the city of Fort William should contribute towards the cost of the work. I think a suitable contribution would be the paving of the subway; and, I therefore suggest that an order should go accordingly; the work to be completed by the first of August next.

Under the provisions of section 289, subsection (f), the municipal council may, with the approval of the Ontario Railway and Municipal Board raise the money by debenture necessary to carry out this work without having to submit the matter to the electors, or without the necessity of special legislation.

The Chief Commissioner Drayton and Commissioner Goodeve concurred.

APPLICATION OF THE CANADIAN NORTHERN ONTARIO RAILWAY COMPANY TO CROSS MONKLAND BOULEVARD, IN THE TOWN OF CARTIERVILLE, QUE., IN THE COUNTY OF JACQUES CARTIER, QUE.

Judgment, Mr. Commissioner McLean, February 23, 1915:

Application is made by the Canadian Northern Ontario Railway Company to cross Monkland Boulevard, in the town of Cartierville, by a grade crossing.

At the hearing, representations were made on behalf of the town of Cartierville, the town of St. Laurent, the Union Land Corporation, the D. J. McAnulty Realty Company, and the city of Montreal.

The city was interested as to the question of proper re-enforcement of the sewer on Monkland Boulevard, which the city had constructed, it being represented that the crossing of the boulevard by the railway company would necessitate such re-enforcement. The other parties applicant were desirous of having the track of the railway elevated at this point, so that the highway traffic might be carried along the existing highway level, and protection afforded by means of grade separation.

The Canadian Northern tunnel, which is a double track structure and which is to be electrically operated, is three and one-third miles east of Monkland Boulevard. The eastern end of the Cartierville yard is 3,100 feet west of Monkland Boulevard. On account of the nature of the operation of the tunnel, the traffic between the tunnel and the Cartierville yard will be operated by electricity. Further, on account of the double track construction of the tunnel it will be necessary to continue the double tracking to the yard.

Whether the crossing is constructed at grade or whether there is grade separation, there is involved a common distance of one mile, from mileage 47·4 to mileage 48·4.

The cost of a mile at low grade, i.e., with the grade crossing, has been checked out by the Chief Engineer of the Board, with the following result, this being for double track construction:—

Item.	Unit.	Quantity.	Price.	Cost.
Temp. trestle	lin. ft.	.....	.....	.....
Trainfilling from trestle	cub. yds.	14,000	$0 40	$ 5,600
Lifting	"	53,000	0 52	27,560
Steel bridging excavation	"	300	0 75	225
Concrete	"	450	8 00	3,600
Steel	lbs.	144,000	0 05	7,200
Timber	F.B.M.	.....	.....	.....
				$44,185

As this portion of the line is to be electrically operated, provision must be made for pedestals for the posts to support the overhead work; this will add $13,500 to the above figures.

If the grade separation is made so as to give a clearance of 15 feet by 50 at Monkland Boulevard, the cost of the work between the given mileages already referred to, and including the necessary work at Monkland Boulevard will be as set out in the following table:—

Item.	Unit.	Quantity.	Price.	Cost.
Temp. trestle	lin. ft.	2,300	$6 00	$13,800
Trainfilling from trestle	cub. yds.	90,000	0 40	36,000
Lifting	"	75,000	0 52	39,000
Steel bridging excavation	"	800	0 75	600
Concrete	"	1,650	8 00	13,200
Steel	lbs.	210,000	0 05	10,500
Timber	.....	.....	.....	480
				$113,580

To this must be added, on account of the electrical operation of the road, for the same reason as given in connection with the electrical operation of the low grade line, $22,500; that is to say, between the low grade line and the high grade line; there is in round numbers a difference of $78,000.

Under existing conditions of traffic, the board would not be justified in directing at such an expense the grade separation at the present time. With changed conditions, the question of the appropriate method of protection is a matter which can be raised by the parties interested; and the action now taken is without prejudice to their rights in connection with any application they may desire to make.

Assistant Chief Commissioner Scott and Deputy Chief Commissioner Nantel concurred.

COMPLAINT OF T. H. PATRICK OF SOURIS, MANITOBA, AGAINST THE CANADIAN PACIFIC RAILWAY COMPANY REFUSING TO PLACE CARS ON THE SIDING RUNNING INTO HIS LUMBER YARD AT SOURIS, MAN., WHICH SIDING WAS CONSTRUCTED UNDER AGREEMENT MADE BETWEEN HIM AND THE COMPANY OF DATE JULY 20, 1905.

Judgment. Chief Commissioner DRAYTON, February 26, 1915:

An application has been made by Mr. T. H. Patrick for an order of the board directing the Canadian Pacific Railway Company to continue the service hitherto afforded the applicant over the spur leading up to and into his lumber yard at Souris.

This spur appears to have been laid under an agreement entered into between the company and the applicant, dated July 20, 1905.

The construction of the spur was authorized by order of the board No. 3203.

The spur serving the applicant does not run to the company's line but is constructed from the spur which has already been laid to the McCullough and Herriot mill.

The agreement is an agreement drawn under the usual form of the Canadian Pacific under which a rental amounting to $19.75 is to be paid by the applicant to the company. The applicant is also bound to pay the company all costs of signals, signalmen, and other like expenses at any time incurred by reason of the use of the siding by the applicant; and also all costs and expenses incurred by the railway company in maintaining and keeping the siding in good repair and condition, clear of snow and open for traffic.

The present difficulty arises owing to the fact that it has been necessary for the company to expend money in maintaining the mill spur, which is used for the purpose of placing cars on the applicant's spur over which the applicant's cars have to pass. The railway company has billed the applicant for one-half the cost, and the applicant has refused to pay the bill. On this refusal the company has declined to continue to serve the spur, treating its maintenance as maintenance which is payable by the company under the agreement.

On taking the matter up with the railway company the railway company points out that it has not sought to charge the applicant with one-half of the cost of maintaining the whole mill spur; but merely that part of the mill spur which is used jointly by the applicant and the mill-owners; that the mill-owners naturally object to paying the whole cost of maintenance; and that it is only reasonable and just that the cost should be apportioned half and half as the company now claims.

Mr. Patrick also claims that the railway company uses the mill spur itself for switching when placing cars on the loaded spur which branches off the mill spur on the main line. The company states that it is a fact that a small part of the mill spur and the loading spur is used for switching purposes, but that all that Mr. Patrick is asked to do is to bear a portion of the rental and maintenance charges of the mill spur from the point at which the grain loading spur leaves it to the point from which his spur is constructed, marked "B" on the blue print, so that the latter question raised by Mr. Patrick has no bearing on the issue.

The parties were asked for a statement showing the respective use of that part of the mill switch in question. Mr. Patrick stated that he unloaded about 135 cars on his switch in 1914. He had no statistics as to movements on the mill switch, but thought that they were much greater, his estimate being that they were three times as many.

The company's actual returns for cars placed on the applicant's spur, however, amounts to 154. These cars were all loaded, no loaded cars being lifted from his spur For mill purposes during the same period, 208 loaded cars were carried over the spur for the mill and 358 loaded cars lifted from the spur.

The agreement is an agreement which is terminable at any particular time on two months' notice, and irrespective at all of any question of rights of the company

to discontinue the service and of the applicant to obtain a forced service under section 226 of the Act. It would seem to me that the fair and reasonable thing to be done is that the maintenance of that part of the mill spur used in common should be divided between the owners of the mill spur and the applicant on the wheelage basis. Under this basis each industry will be charged with every car whether full or empty taken over the spur. On the figures shown, the applicant having loaded no cars the movement in his case would amount to 308 cars as 154 cars were delivered on the switch loaded, and, of course, had to be taken off. With the very best loading of returned empties possible, there would be 508 movements on the mill spur. The chances are that this idea of reloading was never accomplished, and that, as a matter of fact, car movements from the mill were greater. The applicant desires, however, that a reasonable basis should be struck. In so far as the present bills are concerned, probably the fairest solution is for the owners of the mill to pay two-thirds of the cost of maintenance of that part of the spur which is used in common and the applicants one-third.

As the parties merely desire an expression from the board as to what the fair thing to do under the circumstances would be, no formal order need be issued.

Assistant Chief Commissioner Scott concurred.

COMPLAINT OF MR. W. J. WOOD, OF WINNIPEG BEACH, MAN., AGAINST MIXED TRAIN SERVICE ON THE LINE OF THE CANADIAN PACIFIC RAILWAY COMPANY BETWEEN WINNIPEG AND RIVERTON.

Judgment, Mr. Commissioner McLean, February 26, 1915:

Riverton is located at the end of the Winnipeg-Riverton branch. Application is made for a re-arrangement of the train service so as to give a mixed service three days a week and a passenger train service three days a week, instead of the mixed train service six days a week now in operation. The existing service is on the winter schedule. It is contended by the applicant that the existing service is unsatisfactory, on account of the delay in transit.

While reference is made to an alleged better service afforded those resident along the Stonewall-Arbourg line, it does not appear that, in the absence of any evidence as to similarity of conditions, and the further lack of any affirmative showing that the difference in service alleged to exist has had the result that those located along the Stonewall line have, as the result of the difference in service, profited at the expense of those located along the Winnipeg-Riverton line, the service on the Stonewall line can be taken as the measure of what is proper on the Riverton branch.

Consideration must be given to the receipts and expenditures in connection with the operation of the service.

During the period between November 3 and December 15, 1914, the passenger earnings from the operation of thirty-six trains averaged $44.56 per day. On the average, there were less than thirty passengers per day each way.

The operating expenses of the service have been checked. Taking purely out of pocket costs, making no allowance whatever for contribution to the general expenses of operation and maintenance, the situation works out as follows:—

The train mileage for the round trip is..	164 miles.
The revenue from passenger train service per day is..	$44 56
The revenue per passenger train mile is..	0 27
The cost per train mile of operating a tri-weekly passenger train would be	0 54

The result would be that the passenger train mile earnings would be one-half the passenger train mile cost of operation. On this showing, the board is not justified in directing the additional service asked for.

Chief Commissioner Drayton concurred

RE STORAGE OF MERCHANDISE BY THE RAILWAY COMPANIES AT FORT WILLIAM AND PORT ARTHUR.

Judgment, Chief Commissioner DRAYTON, March 3, 1915:

The issue raised in this case has a direct bearing on the question of the storage of merchandise by the railway companies at Fort William and Port Arthur. Under the practice that obtained in the past—and indeed still obtains—the railway companies have accepted consignments from connecting steamers, with manifests to Port Arthur and Fort William, for subsequent forwarding, the goods being stored in the companies' warehouses to the order of the owner, and held free of storage charges until the re-opening of navigation.

This arrangement has, of course, been a very considerable benefit to consignees west of Fort William, as it has enabled them to bring up merchandise before the close of navigation, at the summer lake-and-rail rates, and keep it at the lake ports, without cost, until such time as they desire to have it forwarded by rail during the winter. The result is that the method of delivering is as convenient to the consignee as if his merchandise were forwarded by the all-rail route, for delivery at the appropriate time, while he gets the advantage of a combined lake-and-rail rate.

The practice was objected to by the Board of Trade of Fort William; and its complaint was heard by the Board of Railway Commissioners on June 4, 1913, when, at the request of the said board of trade, the question stood over to enable it to take the matter up with other boards of trade and to have necessary tariffs filed, with a view to further consideration.

Fort William objects to the practice, on the ground that it works a grave injustice to its merchants who are selling goods in territory west as well as east of Winnipeg; and that the result of the practice is that they are unfairly discriminated against, the free storage privilege not applying on merchandise for Fort William, but only on goods billed for points west and held subject to furtherance orders on the railway.

The position taken by the railway companies was that they would be very glad to collect storage if they could; but that they were prevented from doing so by exemption from storage charges, under like circumstances, at competitive lake ports at Duluth, Minnesota; Superior, Wisconsin; and Gladstone, Michigan.

The railway companies have since filed a tariff under which a storage charge of 20 cents per ton of 2,000 lbs. will be made, with a maximum charge for storage from December 1 to April 15 of 50 cents; and freight remaining in storage from a previous lake season will be subject, after the 15th of April, to a charge of 5 cents per ton per day, with a maximum rate of 40 cents for the month.

The Estevan Board of Trade has protested against this tariff and the cancellation of the free storage practice. In support of the protest, the said board of trade has forwarded a copy of a letter received from the local branch of the International Harvester Company, which letter, in drawing attention to the proposed charge, points out that the company's own warehouse is not fully adequate for its needs; that it must depend upon the railway companies for some storage, with the result that the storage charge will be an added burden; on investigation, I find that the tariffs of the United States lines provided for free storage at Duluth, Minnesota; Superior, Wisconsin; and Gladstone, Michigan, on west-bound, lake-passage freight destined to Canadian points —the statement of the Canadian carriers as to United States practice at the ports in question is, therefore, confirmed.

The Great Northern, the Northern Pacific, and the Minneapolis, St. Paul, and Sault Ste. Marie Railway Companies have issued new tariffs for their lines of railway running to the United States ports of Duluth, Superior, and Gladstone, which tariffs are practically identical with the tariffs filed by Canadian carriers and provide for a similar storage charge. Doubtless the different carriers acted in consort; but, whether this was so or not, the fact remains that the reason hitherto given by the Canadian

carriers as the explanation of the free storage system at Port Arthur and Fort William—which was objected to by the Fort William Board of Trade as discriminatory,—now disappears to the extent of the storage which is charged at the United States ports mentioned above. The rate is low, lower than ordinarily charged for storage; and to the extent that it is lower than ordinary storage charges, the consignees west of Fort William retain an advantage.

The position of the Fort William Board of Trade now is that the storage rates on goods which were subsequently forwarded should be as high as the rates which local merchants are compelled to pay; and that otherwise the discrimination complained of in the past still continues.

The position of the board of trade is illustrated by the following letter:—

> " The railways operating terminals at the Canadian head of the Lakes and at the United States head of the Great Lakes have entered into a joint arrangement, effective April 1, 1915, under which a charge of 20 cents per ton per month will be made for goods stored in transit, which is satisfactory, except that local merchants are compelled to pay a higher storage charges on goods taken delivery of here.
>
> " The Fort William Board of Trade would, therefore, request the Canadian Railway Commission to cause the tariff now in effect, or any that may hereafter be in effect covering storage charges on goods delivered locally, to be amended so that the charges will not exceed those applying to goods held for shipment to points beyond."

I am of the opinion that the tariff as filed is free from objection.

The complaint of consignees at western points that they are now being charged something which they were not charged before, cannot be entertained, as the competitive situation which was the main justification for the free service has disappeared, at least to the extent that the United States carriers have advanced their rates.

If the Canadian carriers had not put in the tariffs now under consideration, effect would have been given to the complaint of Fort William, to the extent that United States exemption from storage charges has disappeared.

Regarding the Fort William contention that all storage forwarding rates should be at a parity with rates for local storage, it is to be observed that no attack is made upon the local storage rate on the ground that it is unreasonable or too high. This may or may not be so. The local rate would seem to be the one which usually obtains: but the complaint is, not that this local rate is of necessity too high, but that both rates should be on a parity. Under the Act and according to universal practice, rates which might otherwise of necessity be charged on a parity, may differ, one from the other, as a result of competitive conditions. So long as the storage rates charged by the Canadian carriers are as high as those charged by the United States carriers, on goods to be forwarded to the west, there is no ground for interference by this board.

Assistant Chief Commissioner Scott and Commissioner Goodeve concurred.

RE GRAND TRUNK PACIFIC SIDING AT ST. LOUIS, SASK.

Judgment, Chief Commissioner DRAYTON, March 3, 1915:

The board issued an order on October 30, last calling for the construction of a siding at this point with a trailing point switch towards the bridge over the Saskatchewan river. The work was to be completed within thirty days.

The board's attention has since been called to the fact that the bridge has not been completed, and that the siding as ordered cannot be operated until the bridge is finished. This seems to be quite correct.

The company's delay in completing the bridge, however, of itself affords no reason why the settlers at St. Louis should not be given such a service as the company can now give with its available facilities. The line has been opened for traffic, and the question is entirely in the board's hands.

Mr. Sager, who lives at St. Louis, writing from St. Louis states that all freight for St. Louis is unloaded at the siding at Hoey, and that the railway company has absolutely refused to accept freight beyond Hoey, although a regular service is run to St. Louis. Mr. Sager also points out that the result is that freight from St. Louis left at the Hoey siding, at which there is no agent, is very often stolen, as the St. Louis people never know when it arrives or when they should go to Hoey to look after it.

Hoey is three and a half miles away from St. Louis. St. Louis is the point of the old settlement. Hoey is a point where it is hoped that a town will be built as the result of changed conditions of transportation which the railway will bring about. In other words, Hoey is a place which is brought into being as a result of the railway, and is a townsite proposition which may or may not be successful.

I am at an utter loss to understand why the settlers and others living at St. Louis are not entitled to have their freight unloaded where they live, instead of its being left at Hoey in no person's care and without such advice to the consignees as would enable them to properly look after it. Or again, why consignees residing at St. Louis are to be compelled to dray their freight over country roads for an unnecessary distance of three and a half miles.

If the railway is to be so operated as to compel people from St. Louis to live at Hoey, then the policy can be understood. It is impossible to allow any railway company to so carry on public business.

A copy of the letter of complaint has been furnished the railway company which has justified the delay in building the spur for the reason already stated; and also for the reason that it did not get a certified copy of the plan showing the manner in which the railway was to be built soon enough to construct it before the frost set in.

The spur as directed was roughly located on the company's own plans, and there never was any intention of tying the company's hands to any exact plan of location. In effect all that the board ordered was that a commercial siding should be constructed at St. Louis. I, however, propose to deal with the matter giving full effect to the company's reasons as to why the spur has not yet been constructed, and will assume that its application to the board for a certified plan of the spur to be built on railway location which had never been surveyed except by the company's engineers, was made in entire good faith. In so far, therefore, as delays in connection with the construction of the switch itself is concerned, I say nothing, and no order creating a penalty for default will issue.

On the other hand, the company in its answers to the complaints shows that it has already constructed a spur 390 feet long, located on the east side of the main track, for the use of contractors erecting the bridge; and that, subsequently the spur was changed and connected with the south end.

The company also says:—

> "The spur is easily accessible from the public road diversion which crosses our main track, there being a good trail on the east side of the track leading from the public road to the spur. The cut alongside of the spur has been widened so that teams can drive up to the spur and also turn around. The spur is, therefore, accessible from the town of St. Louis by means of the surveyed road through the town, which connects with the road diversion referred to if slightly extended and connected at the north instead of the south end, the spur above mentioned would be in accordance with the board's order."

Under such circumstances, the refusal of the company to deliver freight at St. Louis becomes all the more extraordinary. The train movement at the point in

question is so slight, that even if there had been no siding at all, the company would have been at no trouble whatever in delivering freight at St. Louis.

An order should now go directing the company to accept freight for and freight from St. Louis (as well as express matter), just so soon as an express service is afforded on the line in question, in case one does not already exist.

The company must also supply a box car to be left on the siding referred to in the company's letter as a receptacle for less than carload freight consigned to St. Louis.

While no difficulty has been pointed out by the company as to such a use of the spur, in case the company claims that the whole of this spur which it now has must be used for the convenience of its contractors, then it must extend forthwith the spur for a sufficient length necessary to accommodate the car; or else take the car off its wheels and place it at a convenient spot where it can be reached from the travelled highway to St. Louis. This service must be inaugurated without delay.

Commissioner Goodeve concurred.

IN THE MATTER OF THE GRAND VALLEY RAILWAY COMPANY.

Judgment, Chief Commissioner DRAYTON, March 4, 1915:

The board's attention has been called, by the Ontario Railway and Municipal Board, to the anomalous position of this railway.

The Port Dover, Brantford, Berlin, and Goderich Railway Company was incorporated by Dominion statute 63-64 Victoria, chapter 73, with power to construct and operate a railway from Port Dover through Simcoe and Waterford, in the county of Norfolk, to Brantford; thence to Berlin, in the county of Waterloo; and thence, in a northwesterly direction, through the counties of Perth and Huron, to the town of Goderich.

By a further Act of the Dominion Parliament, 2 Edward VII, chapter 91, the name of the company was changed to that of the Grand Valley Railway Company.

The Brantford Street Railway Company was incorporated under an Act of the province of Ontario, 42 Victoria, chapter 73.

By the Dominion Act, 6 Edward VII, chapter 102, authority was given the Grand Valley Railway Company to enter into agreements with the Brantford Street Railway Company and other companies under which the Grand Valley Railway Company might be empowered to acquire the undertaking of the Brantford Street Railway Company.

In May, 1907, application was made by the Grand Valley Railway Company to the board, the application being made under the provisions of section 281 of the Railway Act, 1903, for an order of the board sanctioning the proposed agreement under which that railway company acquired the undertaking and assets of the Brantford Street Railway Company.

As directed by the board, public notice of the application was given.

No objection apparently was made to the transfer by the city of Brantford, with a result that the agreement, which was subsequently dated August 27, 1907, was recommended by the board to the Governor in Council for sanction by order dated October 3, 1907, the agreement being ratified by order in council dated October 25, 1907.

As above noted, the whole of the railway owned by the Brantford Street Railway Company then became part of the Grand Valley Railway system, a recital of the agreement stating:—

> "And whereas it is believed by the parties hereto that it will be advantageous as well to the parties hereto and their respective shareholders as to the

municipalities through which the said respective railways now run, and to the public generally, that the railways so owned by the parties hereto should be so dealt with as to be capable of being operated as a continuous and connected line of railway."

The Grand Valley Railway Company has since become insolvent, and the city of Brantford, under the Provincial statute 4, George V, chapter 63, section 6, was authorized to pass by-laws for the purchase of the franchises, property, rights, and privileges of the Grand Valley Railway Company in the city of Brantford and counties of Brant and Waterloo.

Power, by the same Act, is given the corporation to pass by-laws providing for the election of a commission to manage, operate, improve, and extend the railway subject to the provisions of the Public Utilities Act of the province, with the further provision that, until the election of such a commission, the municipality may itself appoint a commission to act in its stead. The Ontario Railway and Municipal Board points out that the city has acted on this legislation and acquired the system of the Grand Valley Railway Company.

Beyond all question, urban street railway systems, are matters which properly fall under the provisions of the British North America Act within the jurisdiction of the Province, and apart from any legal question of provincial rights but as a mere matter of expediency and public convenience should be operated under that local jurisdiction. The present case is, of course, complicated by the fact that the Grand Valley System was not merely an urban system, but also included lines running out of the city and which as contemplated under the Act of Incorporation were of considerable extent, therefore justifying to this extent the original incorporation.

Much doubt may be expressed, however, as to the advisability of ever incorporating into a railway system as contemplated by the Act of Incorporation of the Grand Valley the purely local service afforded by the Brantford Street Railway Company.

The city of Brantford has also purchased not only that part of the railway used for its local business, but the whole system.

The board wrote Mr. Henderson, solicitor for the city, stating that its attention had been called to the question of the right of the municipality to operate the railway, and asking for a reference to the statutes that might confer such right and under what authority the railway was being operated. Mr. Henderson's reply is as follows:—

"Brantford, February 26, 1915.

"A. D. Cartwright,
"Secretary, Board of Railway Commissioners,
"Ottawa, Ont.

"File 23686—*Re* Grand Valley and Brantford Street Railway.

"Dear Sir:

"Upon my return to the office I am in receipt of your letter of the 23rd instant.

"The corporation of the city of Brantford has assumed that it has the right to operate the Grand Valley Railway in pursuance of its purchase of same. If we are in any error with regard to our rights we shall be very glad to be set right by the board and to take any steps that are needful to comply with its regulations in that regard.

"By chapter 63 of the statutes of Ontario of 1914, the city of Brantford obtained special legislation, and, among other things, you will observe by clause 6, that the city is empowered to pass by-laws for the purchase of the franchises, property, rights and privileges of the Grand Valley Railway Company in the city of Brantford and the counties of Brant and Waterloo. Pursuant to this authority a by-law was passed which is set forth in Schedule "A" to the Act.

"In pursuance of the further powers of the various subsections of the Act, the city of Brantford has appointed a commission to manage, operate, improve and extend the railway, and in due course it is the intention that a commission shall be elected to supersede the present commissioners. You will observe that the Act gives us power to appoint commissioners until such time as we shall elect same.

"The city of Brantford entered into possession of the road last August, and immediately thereafter proceeded to improve it both as to its road-bed and rolling stock, and I think I can safely say that any person who saw the railway previous to its ownership by the city would not recognize it now as the same railway.

"I hope the above will answer your question fully, and if not will be glad to furnish such information as required.

"Yours truly,

(Sgd.) "W. T. HENDERSON."

In my opinion the right of the city of Brantford to operate this Dominion undertaking is subject to the provisions of section 299 of the Railway Act. So far as the acquisition of the line is concerned, I assume that it has been properly acquired by the city. So far as operation by the city is concerned, the question is as to whether it has any corporate power to operate a Dominion franchise. Undoubtedly the Ontario statute referred to gives the city enabling rights, such rights that allow it to purchase the assets of the railway company, I nevertheless think, that its provisions cannot clothe the city with the right to operate a Dominion railway. In other words a provincial legislature cannot authorize the operation any more than it could the construction of a railway declared to be for the general advantage of Canada. The result is that the city had the right to use municipal funds in the acquisition of the railway and now owns the undertaking but without power enabling it to operate this Dominion franchise under the Dominion Act. In such case the provisions of the section apply, and the city may operate under leave of the Minister of Railways, with the obligation, during the next session of the Parliament of Canada, of applying for an Act which would enable the city to hold, operate, and run the railway.

As a matter of fact only a comparatively small part of the railway authorized by the incorporation has ever been built, and it would occur to me that the advisability of the withdrawal of the railway from the jurisdiction of Parliament might be considered. An analogous action was taken by Parliament in the case of the Montreal Park & Island Railway, 1-2 George V., c. 115, under which that company was authorized to enter into an agreement with a number of provincially incorporated companies named for conveying or leasing to such companies or any of them, in whole or in part, its undertaking including its charter, contracts, franchises, rights, powers, privileges, exemptions, and also the lands, railways, rights of way, works, plants, machinery and other property to it belonging.

Should the city adopt this suggestion appropriate legislation would enable it to acquire the Grand Valley Railway and operate it under its existing provincial powers under the supervision of the Ontario Railway & Municipal Board.

I might add that the only other municipality to my knowledge operating a railway subject to Dominion jurisdiction is the city of London, Lessee of the London & Port Stanley Railway.

In this instance express power was conferred on the city to "make, complete, equip, operate, alter, maintain, and manage the railway," 4-5 George V, chapter 96, section 2, and section 5, conferred on the London Railway Commission "the whole management and control of the making, completion, equipment, operation, alteration, and maintenance of the said The London and Port Stanley Railway for and as the agents of the corporation."

Concurred in by Commissioner McLean.

APPLICATION OF MISS GERTRUDE LAKEMAN, ASPDIN WOMEN'S INSTITUTE, ASPDIN, ONT., RELATIVE TO DANGEROUS CROSSINGS BETWEEN ASPDIN AND HUNTSVILLE, ONT., ON THE TOWN LINE BETWEEN STISTED AND STEPHENSON, ONT..

APPLICATION OF THE ASHWORTH WOMEN'S INSTITUTE PER MRS. WM. H. DEMAINS, ETWELL, ONT., FOR AN UNDERGROUND PASSAGE BENEATH THE RAILWAY LINE ON THE TOWN LINE BETWEEN STISTED AND STEPHENSON TOWNSHIPS, LOT 31, AT WHAT IS KNOWN AS "UNION SCHOOL CROSSING."

Judgment, Mr. Commissioner McLean, March 5, 1915:

Application is made by Miss Gertrude Lakeman, on behalf of the Aspdin Women's Institute, drawing attention to the alleged dangerous condition of a railway crossing on the Grand Trunk railway between Aspdin and Huntsville, on the town line between Stisted and Stephenson, in the district of Muskoka, and asking for an inspection of the crossing. The application does not set out what protection is asked for.

Accompanying the application is a resolution of the municipality of Chaffey stating that it endorses the action of the Aspdin Women's Institute in applying to the railway for an underground crossing. A similar resolution from the municipality of Stisted also is attached to the resolution; and, further, there is a resolution of the town of Huntsville endorsing the application for an underground crossing.

There is also on file a letter from the secretary of the Ashworth Women's Institute asking for the construction of an under-crossing at the point in question. In this application, it is stated that the approach from Stisted north does not give a view of the track from the south, and that trains come very suddenly in view when people are near the track.

The railway in its reply states that a subway at the crossing would cost approximately $4,000, and it is of opinion that this expense is unnecessary, it being stated that whatever additional protection is necessary might be obtained by cutting down some trees in the northeast corner.

The crossing is on the town line between Stephenson and Stisted. The town line at this point runs, roughly, east and west. The side line between lots 30 and 31 runs north and south intersecting the town line. It is, however, not continued across the right of way of the railway. At a point north of the right of way and adjacent to the school-house, the traffic of the side line is diverted into the town line, thence continuing easterly to the crossing of the right of way on the town line. South of the track, the traffic is again diverted westerly from the town line and into the side line. The crossing on the town line is a skew crossing. The railway right of way crosses the town line at an elevation. The level of the track is about 10 feet above the level of the surrounding land on the east side of the right of way, and is about 20 feet above the level of the surrounding land on the west side.

The matter has been inspected on the ground both by the board's Engineering Department and by its Operating Department, and it appears that by certain improvements in the grade of the approaches and certain additional matters yet to be set out, the situation can be adequately taken care of. The grades of the approaches are not according to the board's standard requirements of 1 in 20; they are, in fact, about 1 in 15.

Approaching the track from the west on the town line, there is on the north side of the right of way a ridge which is about 4 feet below the level of the track. This ridge is located about 800 feet west of the crossing. West of this ridge there is nothing to obstruct the view of approaching trains.

From the ridge, there is a view which covers as far as the crossing. At 300 feet west of the crossing, trains can be seen 200 feet east of the crossing; and looking backward from this point, there is a view of about 1,200 feet in regard to trains approaching from the west. It should, of course, be noted that the traveller is here

travelling in the same direction generally as a train approaching from the west, and is approaching the track at an angle which interferes with the efficiency of his view in regard to trains from the west.

The side line already referred to, approaching the crossing from the north, has the following situation: The southwest corner of the intersection between the town line and the side line has the vision obscured by some clumps of trees. When the traveller is within 200 feet of the crossing, he has, looking west, a view of approximately 1,200 feet. At the southeast corner adjacent to the school-house, there are also some clumps of trees, which, however, are not of such growth as to obstruct the view to the same extent as at the southwest corner; so, at a point about 200 feet from the crossing, the traveller has a view of about 2,000 feet of trains approaching from the east.

As indicated, the town line runs, roughly, east and west. Approaching the crossing on the town line from the east, there is, at a distance of about 400 feet from the crossing, a house on the north side of the road, from which point there is a view of about half a mile northeasterly; and from a point about 300 feet from the crossing, there is a view of about three-quarters of a mile in the same direction.

Looking southwesterly along the railway, there is a view at any point within 500 feet of the crossing of about half a mile.

As pointed out, the obstacles in the way of vision are the ridge, as referred to, and the trees at the southeast and southwest corners of the intersection of the side line and the town line.

As already indicated, the crossing has no approaches built on grades in accordance with the board's standard requirements. These approaches must be built to the board's standard requirements, that is to say, a 5 per cent grade; this work to be done by the 15th of June. The approaches have also to be widened to 20 feet, which is the board's standard requirement; this work also to be done by June 15. The board's standard requirements in regard to fencing are also to be complied with by the same date.

At the southeast corner of the intersection of the side line and the town line, there are some small trees on the right of way which the railway has undertaken to remove. There are also located on the school-house lot some small trees adjacent to the road, which if cut down by the municipality will still further improve the view.

The ridge west of the intersection of the side line with the town line has been referred to. In building the approaches to a 5 per cent grade, the railway will make use of the material contained in this ridge, thereby improving the view at this point. This will cut down the ridge by at least 2 feet, thereby adding at least 200 feet of view.

One phase of the complaint is that with the existing condition of approaches, people approaching the track from one side have not a view of people driving up the track on the other side. In regard to this, it may be said that the effect of the improvements to the grades on the approaches will be that any person driving up one side can, when within 100 feet of the crossing, see a person driving up from the other side who is at a point within 100 feet; that is to say, there will be a clear view on the approaches of 200 feet.

The necessity of constructing an under-crossing or subway at this point has been earnestly pressed upon the board, the elevation of the right of way being a factor which the applicants have considered. The railway has, in its reply, stated that there have been no accidents at the point in question; and the applicants say that the question of the absence of accidents is not a test by which the necessity for protection is to be measured. The applicants are quite justified in saying this, and the board has, of course, never taken the position that it will not deal with protection at a crossing unless there has been a fatal accident at that point.

However, the board has to look at the matter from a general standpoint. It has to be recognized that the traffic at this point is not heavy, the settlement being

admittedly sparse. The board in dealing with an application of the Board of Trade of Georgetown, in regard to the construction of a subway under conditions which in point of the elevation of the right of way were even more favourable for separation of grades than in the present application, used the following language:

> "It would be not only in the public interest but eminently agreeable to the board, if it were possible, either by elimination or protection, to deal with all existing level crossings at one time; but this is out of the question. The board must in fairness consider the ability not only of the municipality but also of the railway to contribute to the cost of protective works; and it must, therefore, in dealing with such crossings take first of all the most dangerous ones; and while opinions may differ, it appears to me that the crossings where the traffic is more dense should be looked after first."

What there was said is pertinent here, and all that the board is now justified in doing is to have the improvements made which are covered by the directions above given.

Concurred in by Chief Commissioner Drayton and Commissioner Goodeve.

APPLICATION OF THE ESQUIMALT AND NANAIMO RAILWAY COMPANY FOR AUTHORITY TO REMOVE STATION AGENT FROM COWICHAN, B.C.

Judgment, Chief Commissioner DRAYTON, March 11, 1915:—

It is true that the earnings at this station fall below the amount requisite under the board's general order dealing with the appointment and maintenance of station agents, so that on the face of it, it would appear that effect should be given to the company's application. However, an analysis of the figures shows that the passenger business is abnormally large, amounting to 42 per cent of the total takings, which, while below the ordinary requirements, are still considerable, and the express business amounts to 14 per cent of the same, while the freight business amounting in all to 44 per cent, is largely L.C.L. business.

With a business of such a character a station agent is much more required for the proper transaction of business than at many stations with far larger gross earnings, where the business is chiefly confined to carload movements.

I am of the opinion that the application should be dismissed.

Commissioner Goodeve concurred.

CANADIAN CHINA CLAY COMPANY *v.* CANADIAN NORTHERN RAILWAY COMPANY, *et al.*

Judgment, Chief Commissioner DRAYTON, March 15, 1915:—

This is a complain made by the Canadian China Clay Company, Limited, in respect of rates charged on clay from the company's works at Huberdeau, in the province of Quebec, the terminus of the Montford branch of the Canadian Northern Railway; the distance by freight train movement being 105 miles from Montreal.

The case was listed for hearing at Montreal on January 29, 1915, but was not then concluded, leave being given the railway companies interested to put in joint rates which were stated to be in contemplation, or to make any submissions they desired on the question of rates.

The position of the applicants is perfectly clear. They point out that the cost of production is relatively high, owing to the fact that they have to pay a wage of $2 a day for nine hours work, while the clay with which they enter into competition is mined in Cornwall at a wage cost of twenty shillings a week; that the climatic

conditions in England permit open working throughout the entire year, while in Canada they are such that the operation has largely to be carried on within buildings which, of necessity, have to be heated; and that the applicants are at considerable loss resulting from the employment of men unfamiliar with the new industry, while the Cornwall producer enjoys an unlimited supply of men more or less skilled in the working of clays.

In so far as these different considerations are concerned, the board can give effect to none of them in connection with any rate question. It has been held time and again that rate-regulating commissions have no right whatever to attempt to equalize geographic, climatic, or economic conditions. They are concerned simply and wholly with the question of the reasonableness of the toll which the railway company is seeking to collect for the carriage of a given commodity, irrespective of how it is made, or whence it comes.

The applicants also point out that their cost is further enhanced by the fact that their mines are seven miles from the railway track, necessitating a long wagon haul over rough roads with bad grades. If the output is sufficient, manifestly the proper way of meeting this difficulty is by the construction of an industrial track. It, again, is not a factor which the board has any right to take into consideration.

Clay from Cornwall for Canadian delivery via Canadian ports is unloaded at Montreal. It moves under through bills of lading at a through rate to the point of destination. The charge made by the Canadian rail carrier is in reality its proportion of the through rate from the English port of shipment.

The applicants contend that the import rates from Montreal on the English clay should not be lower than the rates on clay to like destinations from Huberdeau.

Without dealing specifically with this particular issue but with the general principle, it may be said that if the board were to adopt the principle that the import rail rate, practically a proportion of the through rate, could never be lower than the local rate, a serious dislocation of business would result. The whole situation is competitive. Any change in the rate scheduled which would advance the railway import rates, which represent part of the through movement, would simply mean that business that is to-day done at the Canadian port would be moved through New York or some other port in the United States unless similar advances were made by American carriers.

It is not, however, necessary for the disposition of this case to deal with the Montreal import situation at all, owing to the rates which the railway companies have voluntarily agreed to put in from Huberdeau.

The request of the company is, as stated, that the Huberdeau rates to points west should be the same as the Montreal rates; but Huberdeau is from 60 to 80 miles farther than Montreal from the majority of the western destinations. In addition to this, most of the points which the applicants desire to reach are on the lines of either the Grand Trunk or the Canadian Pacific.

It is elemental that for a given distance where two lines have to be employed as against the one the rate is greater. The cost is greater, there being double bookkeeping and the cost of the transfer.

To the nearest destination required, namely, Cornwall, Ont., the distance from Montreal is but 68 miles; from Huberdeau, 148 miles. The railway companies' offer is 10½ cents, while the Montreal import rate is 8 cents. It is obvious at a glance that the 10½ cent rate is, relatively, the lower.

So far as the other stations are concerned, the situation is as follows:

To	Special Import from Montreal.	Present Rates from Huberdeau.	Rates now conceded.	Rates from Huberdeau based on Montreal rates irrespective of transfer or other two line cost.
Campbellford	11	15	14	14½
Port Hope	11	15	14	13
Toronto	11	15¾	14	13
Hamilton	11	15¼	15	13½
Dundas	11	15½	15	13½
Georgetown	11	15¾	15	13½
St. Catharines	11	16½	15	13
Merritton	11	16½	15	13
Niagara Falls	11	16½	15	13
Espanola	15	22½	19	15½
Sault Ste-Marie	15	24¾	19	15½

It would, of course, be a pleasant thing to be able to assist the industry and to help in developing the china clay business in Canada, but it is impossible, under these circumstances, for the board to order any lower rates than those which the railway companies have now conceded.

Assistant Chief Commissioner Scott and Commissioner McLean concurred.

APPLICATION OF THE MUNICIPAL COUNCIL OF TRENTON, ONTARIO, FOR INTERCHANGE BETWEEN THE C.N.R. AND THE C.P.R. AT TRENTON.

Judgment, Assistant Chief Commissioner SCOTT, March 19, 1915:

When this application was originally made, the municipal council wanted interchange between the C.N.R., C.P.R., and G.T.R., as well. Upon the matter being brought to the attention of the railway companies, the Grand Trunk Railway Company by letter from its General Solicitor, Mr. Chisholm, advised the board on October 10, 1914, that it had undertaken to amend its switching tariff to provide for interchange between that company and the C.N.R. at Trenton.

With regard to interchange between the C.N.R. and C.P.R., the board sent its Traffic Officer, Mr. Brown, to Toronto, to report on the traffic conditions to see whether there was necessity for the interchange applied for. Mr. Brown in his report dated November 11, states:

> "I estimate that in normal years there would be an interchange of from 800 to 1,000 cars per annum, and I believe there is a public necessity for such an interchange."

Copies of that report were furnished to the railway companies interested.

At the sittings of the board on the 2nd of March, the board announced that there should be interchange at Trenton between the C.P.R. and the C.N.R. and that the location of the connecting tracks was reserved. The matter was referred to the Board's Assistant Engineer, Mr. Simmons, who has made an inspection on the ground and who recommends that the interchange be put in to the west of the C.P.R. bridge over Ontario Street subway connecting the C.P.R. commercial spur with the C.N.R. yard and roundhouse spur in the vicinity of the junction of Sophia and Ontario streets. The railway companies will be sent a sketch prepared by Mr. Simmons, showing the proposed layout. The board adopts Mr. Simmons' recommendation as to the location of the interchange.

The work should be done by the C.P.R. at its own expense, as by the interchange it will be given access to a number of industries now served by the C.N.R. There will be little or no compensating advantage from the interchange to the latter railway. However, the board is satisfied that the interchange is necessary in the public interest.

The C.P.R. should file plans of the interchange tracks for the approval of an engineer of the board, within 30 days, and the connecting tracks should be installed within 30 days from the approval of the plan.

An order should go accordingly.

Commissioner Goodeve concurred.

COMPLAINT *re* INSUFFICIENT SERVICE ON THE CANADIAN NORTHERN RAILWAY FROM TRENTON TO KINMOUNT JUNCTION.

Judgment, Chief Commissioner DRAYTON, March 19, 1915:

Different complaints have been recently made of insufficient service on the Canadian Northern line running north from Trenton to Kinmount Junction. Complaints have been received from Maynooth, Trenton, the municipal council of the county of Hastings, Bird's Creek, Hyba, Coe Hill, Gooderham, and Lindsay.

Under the old time table, a train leaving Trenton for Maynooth, a distance of 101 miles, at 7.15 a.m., arrived at Maynooth at 12.15 p.m. The train returned from Maynooth at 1.05 p.m., arriving at Trenton at 5.30 p.m.

In addition to this passenger service, a daily freight service was provided. A mixed train was also run from Trenton to Coe Hill, a distance of 72 miles. The train was scheduled to leave Trenton at 1.45 p.m. and arrive at Coe Hill at 5.45 p.m. In the morning, the same train was scheduled to leave Coe Hill at 6.30 a.m., arriving in Trenton at 10.05 a.m. A daily mixed train service was also given from Bancroft to Kinmount, a distance of 53½ miles. The train left Bancroft at 10 a.m., and arrived at Kinmount Junction at 2 p.m., and returning left Kinmouth at 3 p.m., and arrived at Bancroft at 6.30 p.m. This service has been entirely changed by the new time-table that has given rise to the complaints. The direct train service from Trenton to Maynooth disappears altogether. In its place, a train service is supplied from Trenton to Bancroft, a distance of 86 miles. The train is not only a mixed one, but also has to handle the less than carlot business. Under the new running time, this train leaves Trenton at 7.15 a.m. and arrives at Bancroft at 2 p.m. Going south another mixed train leaves Bancroft at 10 a.m., and arrives at Trenton at 5.30 p.m. The business from Bancroft to Maynooth now consists of a tri-weekly mixed service, the train leaving Bancroft at 6 a.m., arriving in Maynooth at 7 a.m., and returning leaving Maynooth at 8 a.m. and arriving in Bancroft at 9 a.m.

The service to Coe Hill is continued as heretofore with the exception that the daily train is also obliged to do the L.C.L. business. The train leaves Trenton at the same time as formerly, but arrives at Coe Hill at 7 p.m., instead of at 5.45 p.m.; and on the south run the train leaves at 5.30 a.m. instead of 6.30. The daily service to Kinmount is discontinued. In its place a tri-weekly mixed service has been inaugurated, with no change in the former running time. No change was required in the running time in this instance, because the Kinmount train always looked after the L.C.L. business.

With every desire to assist the company, in view of the present financial business conditions, I am of the opinion that the new schedule affords an entirely insufficient train service, and has been drawn up without any proper regard for the requirements of the district that the railway company is supposed to serve, even in view of the present business situation.

In so far as the new service from Trenton to Bancroft is concerned, no objection could well be taken to the service being reduced to a mixed service, so long as proper

time was made. There seems to me, however, to be every objection to this train doing the L.C.L. business on a run of this length and with the traffic of stations that there are on this line.

Although the running time has been lengthened to the extent that a train which formerly arrived at Maynooth at 12.15 only reaches Bancroft (a point 15 miles short of Maynooth), at 2 p.m., the running time is not being observed. The investigation that the board has made shows that for 12 consecutive days the train was only once on time. It is but fair to state that, so far as one day is concerned, the 2nd of February, the service was cancelled on account of the storm. The day before the storm, however, the train was one hour and seven minutes late; the 4th February, the next day the train was operated after the storm, was the only day that it arrived on time, while on the 5th of February, it was one hour and fifteen minutes late. The service from Bancroft to Maynooth does not appear to have been put in with regard to anybody's convenience, as although the run is only a short one, it is timed in such a way that no one can leave Trenton for Maynooth without stopping overnight at Bancroft; and then, of course, the passenger must take care that he does not arrive in Bancroft on a day when the Maynooth train has left, as then, he will have to stay over an extra day in each case. In the same way no passenger can leave Kinmount for Maynooth without staying over at Bancroft. At Kinmount the connection is made with the Grand Trunk, and service on that particular branch, is therefore, more important than otherwise would appear having regard to a branch line of its character of but 53 miles in length.

The same delays that the L.C.L. business has occasioned to the train to Bancroft occur on the train to Coe Hill. Under the new time-table the train is supposed to arrive at Coe Hill at 7 p.m.

The following schedule is instructive:—

February 8th, arrived 11.00 p.m.;
February 9th, arrived 11.30 p.m.;
February 10th, arrived 7.15 p.m.;
February 11th, arrived 10.30 p.m.;
February 12th, arrived 10.05 p.m.;
February 13th, arrived 11.00 p.m.

The change could never have been made on the ground of convenience to anybody. Its only attempt to be justified is on the ground of economy and diminishing business.

The company, in defence of its action, points out that on the run from Trenton to Bancroft and Maynooth, and before the schedule was changed, the passenger train earnings per mile dropped from 48 to 34 cents.

Undoubtedly if the question was to be one considered only from the standpoint of passenger earnings, it would be difficult to order an increase of the service. Under the particular circumstances of the case, I am of the opinion that they cannot be so considered. While passenger traffic has fallen off, there has been on the lines under consideration a substantial increase in freight earnings which have more than made up for passenger losses. A fair passenger service is essential in order to accommodate the business of the section served, that very business which has resulted in increased freight operations to the company.

The present schedule cannot be said to in the slightest degree consider that business interest or the convenience of the travelling public. In view of the present existing conditions, I am, however, of the view that all that should be at present ordered is that the company must restore the old schedule providing for the passenger train from Trenton to Bancroft and Maynooth to be run 3 days of the week and on the old time-table. From an analysis of the traffic, public convenience apparently will be best served by having this tri-weekly passenger serivce operated on Monday, Wednesday and Friday of each week. In so far as traffic on Tuesdays, Thursdays and Saturdays is concerned, the company must maintain its present service.

In so far as the service from Trenton to Coe Hill is concerned, the old service only called for a mixed train. Under the present service, however, the running time has been extended one hour south-bound and one hour and fifteen minutes north-bound, making a run north of five hours and a quarter (a distance of 72 miles), and south, four and a half hours.

There seems to be no reason why this service should not be operated under the former time-table, and an order should go accordingly.

There remains to be considered the complaint as to the change of time-table in effect from Bancroft to Kinmount Junction. This section of the line has always been operated separately. It connects on the west with the Grand Trunk at Kinmount Junction, and on the east at Bancroft with the Maynooth and Trenton line.

The line has been so operated as to make connection with the Grand Trunk; but connections have not been made at Bancroft with the Trenton train, with the result that passengers from south of Bancroft on the Maynooth-Trenton line have been obliged to spend the night at Bancroft before proceeding to Kinmount Junction. Owing to this lack of connection, a passenger from a point south of Bancroft desiring to go to points on the Kinmount-Lindsay branch of the Grand Trunk or on the Bancroft-Kinmount branch of the Canadian Northern would be obliged to stay in Bancroft until the following Wednesday. The traffic in this direction, however, appears to be very light, the movement of passengers being from the Grand Trunk over the Canadian Northern line from Kinmount Junction and through Bancroft to points south. My first impression was that the running time should be changed so that connections could be made at Bancroft with the train going to Kinmount Junction but in view of the report of the inspector apparently little or no good would be accomplished by this. As, however, this service works in close connection with the Grand Trunk Lindsay-Kinmount service, which is a daily service, and as I find that no real economy is worked in reducing the service from the former daily service to the tri-weekly service, owing to the fact that the train crews on this division of the Canadian Northern are paid by the month instead of by the run, I am of the opinion that the old service must be restored. Since the above reasons for judgment were written, further representations were made by Mr. Fritch, as follows:—

> "Owing to the depressed business conditions we were obliged to take off the passenger service and substitute mixed service running daily between Trenton and Bancroft, and as service is very light between Bancroft and Maynooth, we substituted tri-weekly service for the former daily passenger service.
>
> "The result of operations on the Ontario lines for the month of January shows a deficit of $24,510.51. Our gross earnings were $123,106.07, operating expenses, $147,616.58, making a loss in operation of $24,510.51.
>
> "I beg to submit, in view of such unfavourable results we should not be required to put on train service which will result in further losses.
>
> "The public justly criticised our original mixed service between Trenton and Bancroft because the local officials did not operate the service as they were instructed to do, but throughout the last two weeks we have divided the work of these mixed trains, and they are practically on time, therefore, the cause of the complaint originally has been removed.
>
> "I would respectfully ask your indulgence during the remainder of March to allow us to continue the present service, and if at the end of that time it can be shown that we are not giving reasonable service we will then put on the tri-weekly passenger service; but I sincerely believe that at the present time we are giving as good a service as can be expected with the amount of traffic moving."

So that no injustice would be worked a new inspection was made.

In his later report, the board's inspector says:—

"Replying to your request, I wish to say that I have made an additional trip of inspection and inquiry to see what changes have been made by the company since my first report, and I find that, so far as the Central Ontario division is concerned, the only change that has been made was with train No. 63, Trenton to Coe Hill. The work of this train has been somewhat divided between train No. 63 and train No. 61, the Bancroft Mixed Train, the Bancroft Mixed Train doing a portion of the switching and local work between Trenton and Ormsby Junction, thus enabling No. 63 to arrive at Coe Hill somewhere near its schedule arriving time. The following is a statement taken from the despatchers' sheet at Trenton, showing the arriving time of No. 63, from March 1, to March 16, inclusive:—

"March 1, arrive Coe Hill: 7.00 p.m., on time.
March 2, arrive Coe Hill: 7.20 p.m., 20 minutes late.
March 3, arrive Coe Hill: 7.00 p.m. on time.
March 4, arrive Coe Hill: 7.10 p.m., 10 minutes late.
March 5, arrive Coe Hill: 7.00 p.m., on time.
March 6, arrive Coe Hill: 7.45 p.m., 45 minutes late.
March 8, arrive Coe Hill: 7.30 p.m., 30 minutes late.
March 9, arrive Coe Hill: 7.05 p.m., 5 minutes late.
March 10, arrive Coe Hill: 8.45 p.m., 1hr. 45 mins. late.
March 11, arrive Coe Hill: 7.15 p.m., 15 minutes late.
March 12, arrive Coe Hill: 7.00 p.m., on time.
March 13, arrive Coe Hill: 7.05 p.m., 5 minutes late.
March 15, arrive Coe Hill: 7.00 p.m., on time.
March 16, arrive Coe Hill: 7.00 p.m., on time.

"This is somewhat of an improvement so far as the Coe Hill train is concerned, but No. 61, the Bancroft Mixed train, that is doing a portion of the Coe Hill train work, is not arriving at Bancroft, as it should, on time. The following is a record showing the arriving time of No. 61 at Bancroft from March 1 to March 16, inclusive:. .

"March 1, arrive Bancroft: 2.20 p.m., 20 minutes late.
March 2, arrive Bancroft: 5.00 p.m., 3 hrs. late.
March 3, arrive Bancroft: 2.00 p.m., on time.
March 4, arrive Bancroft: 2.05 p.m., 5 mins. late.
March 5, arrive Bancroft: 2.00 p.m., on time.
March 6, arrive Bancroft: 2.30 p.m., 30 mins. late.
March 8, arrive Bancroft: 2.05 p.m., 5 mins. late.
March 9, arrive Bancroft: 4.00 p.m., 2 hrs. late.
March 10, arrive Bancroft: 4.00 p.m., 2 hrs. late.
March 11, arrive Bancroft: 3.15 p.m., 1 hr. 15 mins. late.
March 12, arrive Bancroft: 2.20 p.m., 20 mins. late.
March 13, arrive Bancroft: 5.30 p.m., 3½ hrs. late.
March 15, arrive Bancroft: 2.20 p.m., 20 mins. late.
March 16, arrive Bancroft: 3.00 p.m., 1 hr. late.

"You will see by these figures that the relieving of No. 63, the Coe Hill train, of some of the way work between Trenton and Ormsby Junction, has been the cause of more detention to the Bancroft train No. 61. Therefore, I fail to see that there has been any improvement made whatever, and this is the only place there has been any change made. Conditions are the same between Bancroft and Maynooth.

"On Wednesday, March 17, I left Bancroft on No. 62, mixed train, for Trenton, and as for the conditions of this train, I must say the accommodation

is bad, as it occupies from 10 a.m. until 5.30 p.m., to travel a distance of about 80 miles. This train had to wait at nearly every station between Bancroft and Trenton for time. No. 62 could leave Bancroft at the same hour, 10 a.m., and arrive at Trenton at 4.30 or 4 p.m., as No. 62 does not do any switching of any account on the southbound trip. It merely handles the coaches and through loads."

I see no reason why any changes should be made as the result of the later representation. While it is true that the operations on the Ontario lines show a deficit as pointed out, this deficit is the result of operation of lines which can hardly be said to have passed beyond the construction stage. The returns are not a fair indication of the results of Ontario business, and it should be pointed out that while there have been decreases in the passenger service on the traffic on the Trenton-Maynooth and Bancroft line, in the period under review, of $1,196, as a matter of fact there was an increase in freight traffic of $7,062 resulting in a net increase of $5,866 in the earnings of the line for January. Under present conditions, the showing is unique. It is quite evident that whatever conditions may be upon other portions of the Canadian Northern's system in Ontario, the line in question cannot be blamed for the general unsatisfactory traffic return.

Commissioner McLean concurred.

CAMPBELLFORD, LAKE ONTARIO & WESTERN RAILWAY COMPANY'S APPLICATION TO REVISE LOCATION OF ITS COMMERCIAL SIDING AT TRENTON, ONT.

Judgment, Assistant Chief Commissioner SCOTT, March 19, 1915:

By Order No. 21971, dated June 9, 1914, the board approved of the Ontario street commercial spur of the Campbellford, Lake Ontario & Western Railway Company (C.P.R.) at Trenton. The applicants now ask that the location of the spur, where it passes through the subway carrying Ontario street under its main line track, be changed so that the existing track of the C.N.R. through the subway can be used for a short distance so as to provide for one track on Ontario street through the subway instead of two. Before the order was issued approving of the C.L.O. & W. spur on Ontario street, the board visited the location in question and was satisfied that by planking the space between the tracks, the lines of the two railway companies could be placed through the subway without impairing its usefulness for vehicular traffic. It is apparent that the object of the C.L.O. & W. in applying to use the tracks of the C.N.R. is to enable it to get access to the property of the Canadian Creosote Company over the tracks of the C.N.R. which now serve the Canadian Creosote Company's property. This is strenuously opposed by the C.N.R.

The board has decided that there should be interchange tracks between the C.N.R. and the C.L.O. & W. at Trenton. It is suggested that the change which the C.L.O. & W. applies for would enable the two companies to interchange. On the recommendation of its engineer, the board has decided that the interchange between the two companies should take place at a point some distance to the northwest of the subway in the vicinity of the junction of Sophia and Ontario streets.

The board is opposed to allowing one railway company to use the tracks of another, unless it is absolutely necessary in the public interest. The interchange at Trenton can be arranged without the use of the tracks of the C.N.R. by the C.L.O. & W.

Since there is to be interchange at Trenton, cars from the C.P.R. to or from the Canadian Creosote Company's property can be interswitched by the C.N.R. There is, therefore, no necessity for the change in its commercial spur applied for by the C.P.R., and I think the application should be dismissed.

Commissioner Goodeve concurred.

APPLICATION ESSEX TERMINAL RAILWAY COMPANY FOR AUTHORITY TO CONSTRUCT BRANCH LINE TO AND ALONG RUSSELL STREET IN THE TOWN OF SANDWICH, ONTARIO.

Judgment, Chief Commissioner DRAYTON, March 23, 1915:

The application is one made by the Essex Terminal Railway Company, under section 222, for authority to construct a branch line from a point on lot No. 59, town of Sandwich, formerly in concession one of the township of Sandwich, to and along Russell street, from the northerly limit of Lot 59, to the southerly limit of Huron street.

The case was heard at a sitting of the board held at Windsor on March 13, 1915, and after the hearing judgment was reserved so as to enable an inspection of the *locus* to be made by the board. A view was subsequently had at which the different parties interested were present.

Mr. Fleming, who appeared on behalf of the railway company, filed a petition signed by the owners of property fronting on Russell street.

This petition was addressed to the mayor and council of the municipality asking that such action should be taken as would be necessary to secure the extension of the railway along the west side of Russell street, as is proposed in the company's application.

The petition is signed by some eleven owners.

It was stated that the frontage owned by property holders signing the petition amounted to 2,540 feet, with the exception of Mr. Henderson's property. It further appeared at the hearing that Mr. Robert E. Stuart, who owns a large frontage on the west side of Russell street, being perhaps the largest individual owner, but who had not signed the petition, was also in favour of the proposed railway construction on the street.

The application is opposed by other property owners. Mr. Bartlett appeared for Mr. Norman Allen, who represented as he stated a total frontage of 2,416 feet. Mr. Morton and Mr. Henderson also appeared for other property holders in opposition to the proposal.

Mr. Rodd appeared for Miss Gauthier, as well as other property owners. He desired that property owners should be compensated for any damages resulting to their property by reason of the construction proposed, but was of the view, apart from this question, that the highway was one merely in name, and that the construction of the railway should be authorized subject to the condition as to compensation. Mr. Bartlett, who may be regarded perhaps as the chief contestant was very frank in his statement as to the character of the property that would be affected. On being asked as to the character of the property from South street south, he stated:

> "From South street south where the marsh is, it would undoubtedly cost too much to make it suitable for residential purposes, I think there is no doubt about that."

Mr. Fleming asked him:—

> "May I ask one question? Is it possible for that property from this point to be used on the west side for anything but manufacturing purposes?"

Mr. Bartlett's answer was:—

> "I do not think it would be; but I do not see any prospect for its being used for industrial purposes in the near future."

Mr. Rodd agreed that the property in the future must be industrial.

The district from South street south to the present terminus of the railway and running almost entirely along Russell street with the exception of a small block of land owned by Miss Gauthier and the Canadian Salt Company gives a Russell street frontage of approximately 3,000 feet. Out of the whole of this frontage, in so far as property

on the west side of the street is concerned, which is much more immediately affected than property on the east side, as it is intended to place the railway on the west side of the street, the only owner shown to be against the proposal is Mr. Rhineholt Glunns, the owner of lot 24, with a frontage of some 200 feet. The construction contemplated north of South street runs some 1,700 feet to Huron street. The whole of this construction is not necessary, the objective point sought to be reached being the premises of the Cadwell-Sand Company. These premises could be reached by a railway running along the street only as far as lot No. 11, a distance north of South street of some 1,100 feet. The houses on the west side of the street are north of South street. Some of them are owned by the Cadwell-Sand Company, and one owner, apparently uninterested either in the railway or Sand Company has signed the petition. Mr. Sale appeared for the municipality. The municipality's position was that it wanted the railway to be built, but that it should be constructed on the marsh lots lying to the west of Russell street. It objected to the occupancy of the street by the railway, owing to the fact that the street would be narrowed, a danger created, and that its construction would throw liabilities on the town which it should not be asked to take. So far as the last point is concerned, there would, of course, be no liability on the town, as in case the railway is authorized, the company must maintain that part of the highway occupied by its tracks and 18 feet on either side, as well as all street crossings, so that the municipality would be put to no increased cost or liability in connection with the construction.

The necessity for the spur was stated by Mr. Woollatt of the company's executive as follows:

> "As far as the Essex Terminal is concerned, we have constructed a line here (down to the Canadian Salt Co.) at a very great expense. The biggest industry we have is the Canadian Salt Company, but the revenue at present does not begin to meet the interest on the investment. We are, therefore, very desirous of getting all the industries possible located on the line; and we are anxious, of course, to extend this, not only for the proposed factory, but for others that we believe will come, because it is all factory property. We have some thirty-eight factories.
>
> "The Windsor factory district is practically taken up. There is a new factory district in here (to the east) practically taken up. There is some vacant land in Walkerville, some in Ford, and some still down here; but no such desirable property for large industries as on the water front and down to this section."

Mr. Henderson of the Canadian Salt Company appeared in support of the application. In his view the district that would be served by the railway, if constructed, is one of the most desirable in the whole coutry for industrial works; and, if the track is laid, industries will be attracted to the neighbourhood.

Mr. Henderson, from his own experience in industrial work and from his activities as an officer of the Canadian Manufacturers Association, is particularly well-qualified to pass an opinion on the subject that he covers.

On the view which subsequently took place, I am of the opinion that there is really but little doubt, if any, as to the best future for the property, and that the use to which it could be best put from a revenue producing standpoint is industrial.

There is really no issue on the question, as Mr. Bartlett himself admitted that the property was too low and that it would cost too much to fill in for residential purposes. The only other use to which it would occur to me the property could properly be put to would be for park purposes. This was not suggested either by counsel for the municipality or by any person else at the hearing when taking the view.

If the question is one to be considered from the standpoint of property owners and the best ultimate development of the immediate district, apart from any other conditions, the application, therefore, should be granted. Can the question be so considered? I think not. I think it is impossible to say that the municipality's objection to the use of the highway is captious or unreasonable. While it is true that the fee of highways is vested in the Crown in the right of the province for all material purposes, the occupancy of city streets by railway track is a question in which the public right is entirely and adequately represented by the municipality. Tracks have been laid along and across streets with municipal consent; and the municipality's objection to the occupancy of Russell street is entitled to the fullest consideration.

As a matter of law, there is no doubt at all as to the right of the board to authorize the proposed construction. Prior to the constitution of the board, section 238 of the Railway Act of 1888 dealt with the question. The material part of that section reads as follows:—

> "The railway shall not be carried along an existing highway, unless leave therefor has been obtained from the Railway Committee. . . . "

Objection had been made from time to time by municipalities against the use of highways for railway purposes; and an effort was made by the Union of Canadian Municipalities, especially supported by some of the larger cities, to obtain a change in the law, so that no railway could be carried along a highway, even although the railway committee, or the board, was of opinion that the construction should be authorized.

The ever increasing franchise value of rights to operate surface railways in large centres was specially urged: and a change was made in the Act. The material part of the section in question, 235 of the present Act, reads as follows:—

> "The railway may be carried upon, along or across an existing highway upon leave therefor having been first obtained from the board as hereinafter authorized: provided that the board shall not grant leave to any company to carry any street railway or tramway, or any railway operated or to be operated as a street railway or tramway, along any highway which is within the limits of any city or incorporated town, unless the company has first obtained consent therefor by a by-law of the municipal authority of such city or incorporated town."

The effect of the statute, of course, is to recognize the paramount interest of the municipality and require its consent as a condition precedent to the construction on the highway, so far as all street railways or tramways are concerned. The franchise rights that I have referred to are fully protected. On the other hand, Parliament has continued the right of railway construction of railways of the character with which the Railway Act is really concerned, not only across but along the highway. The railway in question is certainly not within the proviso. It carries on merely a freight business and is, in fact, a terminal freight railway, acting as a distributor of freight brought in by the steam lines and a collector of freight to be taken out.

As a matter of practice, the board, in certain cases where railways were constructed along highways, directed compensation to be made to property owners in front of whose property the railway was constructed. On its being held that the board had no power to compel the payment of these damages or to add to the company's liability as prescribed by the appropriate sections of the Act, an amendment was made to section 235 in the year 1911. The amendment strikes out the first words "the railway" of the section and substitutes therefor "subject to the company making such compensation to adjacent or abutting landowners as the board deems proper the railway of the company." This is the provision on which Mr. Rodd relies for his claim as authorizing an order directing compensation to be made to certain property owners.

I am of the opinion, however, that the application should be refused. While the application is meritorious in the sense that a railway is required, that the district in question will undoubtedly be benefited to a greater or less extent by its construction, and that the proposal is supported by a majority of the property owners, I see no reason why the municipality should be compelled to contribute to the undertaking by supplying a free right of way. Besides this, there are other grave objections.

I am of the opinion that the worst possible place to construct a railway is along a highway. The interference of the proper use of the highway is not to be questioned; and it is only a question of time, in most instances, before the conflict of the rival users becomes highly objectionable.

As things are now, I am free to admit that a track down Russell street would make little or no difference. The street is unimproved; there seem to be only two houses on it from South street to the Salt works, and those on the east side; there is little or no traffic on it to be much inconvenienced by the railway. But, on the other hand, Mr. Henderson properly urges its construction by reason of the fact that industries would be established and the line would become busy and useful. If this happened, manifestly the street would also become busy and the conflict between highway use and railway operation would become apparent. The application should be refused.

The lot-owners to the west of the street, who are so much interested in the construction of the line, could, one would think, arrange for a right of way through their properties at a cost which would not prohibit the undertaking. These landowners would be benefited by the construction of the railway; and it is only fair that, in the first instance, they should supply the right of way for the railway which would benefit their property and which they desire the city to give free of cost, or, on the other hand, if exorbitant sums are demanded for the right of way, that their property should continue without railway facilities, rather than that the municipality should be obliged to contribute towards furnishing them.

It may be said that in a case like the present, where the construction of the line would be of obvious advantage, that the board is not properly exercising the discretion placed upon it by the Act; and that, in view of the above findings, justified both by the evidence and by the view, an order should be made as asked. I do not so regard the question at all.

Civil, municipal and provincial rights have, to an extent, of necessity to be invaded if a Dominion railway is to be constructed. Streets must be crossed; and I have no doubt that instances might arise where it would be practically impossible to construct a railway, unless it is laid along a highway; so that, unless in such instances the right is reserved to the board to authorize such construction, the object of the Dominion incorporation might be entirely defeated or fail in some main purpose or object. Such conditions are entirely lacking here. The only difference of construction along the street on the one hand and on the property to the west on the other, is the practically small item of cost which the company would incur by obtaining a right of way through what is largely an unimproved marsh area.

Effect must be given to the municipality's objection.

On asking counsel representing property owners to the west of the street why the railway should not be constructed through their property, the objection was made that if this were the case they would no longer be able to obtain access from their property fronting on the water front to the highway. There is no force whatever in this contention.

The line of the Canadian Pacific railway, for example, south of the Esplanade, in Toronto, was constructed on land acquired from the property owners. It was built directly between the only outlet these owners had from their properties; but, with proper and adequate crossing facilities reserved in each instance.

If the railway is constructed immediately south of the street, similar arrangements could be here made. If, on the other hand, the line is constructed farther to the west, so as to carry the railway more to the centre of the properties interested, in this, there would again be no difficulty in arranging for crossings in the nature of farm crossings, so that access could be had from one part of the property to the other.

Commissioner Goodeve concurred.

APPLICATION OF THE DEPARTMENT OF PUBLIC WORKS, ONTARIO, *re* CROSSING C.P.R. TORONTO-SUDBURY BRANCH, LOT 10, CON. 3, TOWNSHIP OF BURWASH.

Judgment, Chief Commissioner DRAYTON, March 24, 1915:

The Department of Public Works of Ontario applied for the establishment of a highway crossing at a point some 300 feet north of the station at Burwash.

As to the necessity of a crossing at some point in the neighbourhood, owing to the improvements now being made there by the Ontario Government, there is no doubt.

The company, in its answer to the application, points out that the point where the crossing is proposed to be made is in the centre of its yard, that its position is very objectionable, because trains using the sidings would have to cut at the crossing, with the result that the view would be interfered with owing to cars standing on either side; and the company submits that the crossing should be placed at the end of the yard, where the main line only would be crossed and there would be no interference with the siding.

The Department of Public Works, in their answer to the company's reply, object to a crossing at the end of the yard on the grounds:—

1st. That the Ontario government industrial farm of 11,000 acres is situated south of Burwash station. The approach from the south to the station east of the railway is represented as physically impossible, owing to its rough, rocky character. If the crossing were located at the northerly end of the yard, it would be about 4,000 feet added travel on every trip from the farm to the station.

2nd. That the general store and Burwash Post Office are situated immediately across the railway track from the station, and all traffic between them and the station would also be increased by 4,000 feet.

The board has had an inspection made by the engineer's office. From that inspection, it appears that the main siding at Burwash has a length of 4,122 feet, and that at the south end of the station grounds there is a subsidiary siding of 937 feet.

It is, of course, manifestly better, not only in the interests of railway operation, but in that of public safety, that crossings should not be made in station grounds, but should be made, if possible, where only one line has to be crossed and the view cannot be obstructed by standing cars.

The engineer, however, reports that it is impracticable to build a highway which could be accommodated with a crossing to the south-east of the station grounds, owing to the peculiarly rocky and hilly formation of the ground. The engineer, further reports that, as a matter of fact, for the convenience of settlers in the neighbourhood, the Canadian Pacific itself has already provided a crossing at the point where the Government requires a public crossing to be made; and that, the view being excellent, there would be little danger to the public if the crossing were allowed at the point where the department desires it.

Owing to the length of the siding, it is improbable that the crossing would of necessity be blocked by many trains. In case, however, the trains have to be cut at the crossings as pointed out by the company, it is to be remembered that, in such instances, the practice calls for the train-brakeman to stand at the crossing, so that he becomes, for the time being, a watchman over siding tracks.

Under the exceptional circumstances of this case, I am of the opinion that the order should go as asked.

The department in its application points out that, in the patent to the railway, 5 per cent of the land patented is reserved for highways. The railway company, in the correspondence filed, say that more than 5 per cent has already been taken for this purpose. No reply from the department covers this question.

An order will, therefore, be made on the usual terms, that is, the cost of construction and maintenance to be on the applicant.

The right is reserved to the department to make application for the purpose of showing that the 5 per cent reserved has not been exhausted and is sufficient to cover the crossing in question, should it so desire.

Commissioner Goodeve concurred.

APPLICATION HULL ELECTRIC RY. CO. FOR APPROVAL OF STANDARD PASSENGER RATE OF 2½ CENTS A MILE.

Judgment, Chief Commissioner DRAYTON, March 25, 1915:

The Hull Electric Company has applied to the board for an order approving its standard passenger rate which has beeen fixed at 2½ cents per mile.

In ordinary practice, standard rates, both passenger and freight, are filed before the company's operation commences. As contemplated by the Act, the rates must be approved before the company commences business operations. Such rates are, in effect, maximum rates, which may not be exceeded; but which are subject to considerable variations in practice.

The Hull Electric Railway has been a railway in operation for some time. It was in its inception a provincial company, and its operations did not become subject to the jurisdiction of the board until 1913, when an Act was passed declaring the road to be a work for the general advantage of Canada.

As traffic is moving, and apparently moving in a satisfactory manner, under special tariffs, there would seem to be little or no reason why a standard mileage tariff should be approved of. The company already appears to have tariffs sufficient to provide for any movement on its line.

The company, however, claims that it is necessary that its standard tariff should be approved, in order to properly conform to the Act.

The provisions of the Act dealing with the question are provisions which were drawn with particular reference to railways incorporated under it,—the standard tariffs both freight and passenger, having particular application to a new line which, as yet, was without special rates of any kind at all.

Although no useful purpose seems to be served by the approval of the standard passenger tariff, the company appears to be entitled to it. The company also claims that it should not be unfairly discriminated against, but that its standard tariff should be allowed at the same rate as standard tariffs for other electric roads to which the board has already given effect.

The standard rate of 2½ cents has been approved by the board in the case of the tariffs of the Chatham, Wallaceburg & Lake Erie Railway Company, the Grand Valley Railway Company, the Montreal and Southern Counties Railway Company, the Montreal Park and Island Railway Company, the Quebec Railway Light and Power Company and others. For the sake of uniformity, there would seem to be no reason why the same standard rates should not be here recognized, so long as it is understood that the recognition now given is merely a form for the purpose of making an exact compliance with the Act.

As before stated, usually the standard tariffs are approved of in the first instance, before anything is known about the earning powers of the line or the business it would

develop, while in the present case, a good business has already been developed by the company's line.

Under the tariffs now on file, the present rate from Ottawa to Rivermead is 10 cents. On a standard of 2½ cents the rate would be 20 cents; and on a standard of 2 cents the rate would be 15 cents. To Wychwood, the present fare is 10 cents. This would become, on the 2½ cent standard 25 cents; and on a 2 cent standard 20 cents. The present rate to Victoria hotel, at Aylmer, is 10 cents. This would become, on the 2½ cents standard, 30 cents; and on a 2 cent standard 20 cents. The present rate to Queen's Park is 10 cents. On the 2½ cent standard this would become 30 cents; and, on a 2 cent standard 25 cents. The effect of adopting any standard rate would be to more or less interfere with the present rate schedule.

The past practice of the board will, therefore, be continued.

The company's returns for 1913 show a gross earning from operation of $148,368.48 and a net return from operation of $32,717.37. For 1914, a gross earning from operation of $161,963.04, with a net earning of $41,051.28.

Under such circumstances, the board's order should contain the provision that no toll now charged by the company for the carriage of passengers on its line is to be increased, unless permission of the board has been first obtained. It has to be clearly understood that the approval of the regular standard mileage rate is merely for the purpose of complying with the Act, and does not carry with it in the slightest degree any recognition that the company is entitled to advance any of its present rate.

Assistant Chief Commissioner Scott and Commissioner McLean concurred.

RE THE EDMONTON, DUNVEGAN AND BRITISH COLUMBIA RAILWAY.

Judgment, Chief Commissioner DRAYTON, March 26, 1915:

No part of this road has as yet been opened for traffic by the board, but complaints have from time to time been made against the practices obtaining on the railway, which, notwithstanding the fact that the road was not opened for traffic, carried both freight and passengers. This practice, as the board has more than once held, is entirely illegal. Baker, Reynolds & Co. *v.* C.P.R., 10 C.R.C. 151; *re* Brandon, Saskatchewan & Hudson Bay Railway Company, standard tariffs, file, 3370; Randall, Gee & Mitchell *v.* C.P.R., file 24292.

Several petitions have been received by the board as to service and facilities and complaints made against rates charged. For example, complaint was made by Mr. Hunt, of Swan River, with reference to a shipment weighing 2,410 lbs., forwarded to him by the A. MacDonell Company, Limited. The charges made by the J. D. McArthur Company, Limited, for transportation from the Edmonton to Swan River amounted to $32.54 with a cartage charge of 96 cents, in all $33.50. The rate under tariffs approved by the board for railways operating in Alberta on the same goods for the same mileage, would have registered under the railway rate of $8.01 as against $32.54. The Swan River Improvement Association wrote pointing out that the company charged $120 for a car of oats from Edmonton to Swan River, and on provisions a rate of $1.40 per 100 lbs. Under the railway tariffs approved by the board on other railways, the rate on a carload of oats of 30,000 pounds capacity would be $60 a car and for the same movement of oats in a 60,000 pounds capacity car, with a minimum of 56,000 pounds, $112. On produce, the rates would vary per 100 lbs. On a characteristic shipment, for example, of sugar, rolled oats and flour, the authorized rate is 34 cents a hundred pounds. On apples by the box 46 cents a hundred pounds.

On this matter being taken up with the Company, the only answer made is that the company is preparing a tariff which will be submitted at the earliest possible moment, and that freight has been carried to a limited extent by the contractor who is building the road, for the purpose of accommodating people going into the country.

Further allegation is made that, as a matter of fact, the service has been actually carried on at a loss to the contractor; and that, owing to the fact that the railway organization was not complete, every indulgence was asked by the Company.

It is only justice to state that undoubtedly there is a period after the line has been constructed that it is reasonably safe to run over it at a low rate of speed but that the organization and work have not approached that point where it is feasible to give approval to the company to equip its operating staff and do a regular business when shippers have been much convenienced by the company carrying goods, although the practice is entirely illegal; and it may well be that the freight and passengers carried, even at the high charge collected by this railway, were of benefit to the portion of the public using the service. The charges, however, claimed seem to be unreasonably high, even under the special conditions alleged.

The usual practice of the Canadian Pacific in such circumstances is to charge the usual standard rate without applying town tariffs, commodity or through rates.

The charges made by this railway do not appear to have been arrived at by any of these tariffs or to have been arrived at on any principle except as to that of how much could be charged without preventing traffic from moving at all. However, the board has no jurisdiction in the matter. It has no jurisdiction over railways so far as traffic is concerned, until the proper application is made to open for traffic. The question of the board's jurisdiction is fully covered by the authorities already cited. It may well be that, in these extreme cases, the necessity for a change in the Act is shown, and that for the protection of the public some provision should be made in connection with transportation charges, even before the road has passed the construction period.

The company has now made application for leave to open the road for traffic, and has also filed the tariffs as required by the Act.

The tariffs filed are on the mountain scale instead of according to the prairie standard fixed by the judgment of the board in the Western Rates Case.

Mr. MacDonald, who is acting for the company, urges that the higher scale, as a matter of simple justice to the railway, should be adopted. In support of the application, Mr. MacDonald has written the board as follows:—

"OTTAWA, March 25, 1915.

"Dear Sir,—The Edmonton, Dunvegan and British Columbia Railway Company, is authorized to build a line from Edmonton to the British Columbia boundary, 410 miles, and the bonds are guaranteed by the province of Alberta, as follows:—

Miles.	Per Mile.	Amount.	Rate of Interest.	Amount of Interest.
350	$20,000	$7,000,000	4 %	$280,000
60	20,000	1,200,000	4½%	54,000
410		$8,200,000		$334,000

"It is completed to McLennan, 262 miles from Edmonton.

"In addition to the above a line is being built from township 77, range 19, west 5th meridian, to Peace River Landing, and another line is projected from about mile 350 from Edmonton or from township 78, range 6, west 6th meridian. There will also be a line from the main line to Grouard, an old settlement, on Lesser Slave lake.

"I beg to submit to your honourable body reasons why the tariffs filed should be approved by the board. It is not the desire of the company to ask the board for anything unreasonable. It feels, however, it is entitled to a schedule of rates that will help at least to pay its fixed charges:

"(1) The Edmonton, Dunvegan and British Columbia should not be considered in the same category as a through line and enjoying long hauls at profitable rates but as a colonization road going into a new country to develop and establish a business which will take some years, and means considerable financial risk.

"(2) The fact that the Canadian Northern railway for reasons, financial, strategical, or otherwise, thought it fit to establish or to accept the prairie scale of rates from Edmonton to Athabasca is no reason why that scale should be imposed on other roads going into that vast, undeveloped, northern country.

"(3) A glance at the latest map of Northern Alberta as published by the Department of the Interior will show the sparse settlement of the country forty miles from Edmonton. The large forest reserves adjoining the Edmonton, Dunvegan and British Columbia railway is another reason why it is entitled to the schedules as submitted. For 100 miles the proportion of land open for settlement is very small owing to the Lesser Slave Lake forest reserve which the company's line follows from Flatbush.

"(4) In the province of Alberta, from 1885 to 1902, the standard rates were those shown in C.P.R. 270. In 1902 there was a reduction of 7½ per cent from 270, and in 1914, the board authorized a reduction in the Alberta standard rates of 7½ per cent, making the present rates in Alberta 15 per cent less than the standard of 30 years ago. The Pacific standard asked for is 10 per cent higher than No. 270, so that the request of the Edmonton, Dunvegan and British Columbia Railway is not unreasonable. The standard on the Calgary and Edmonton and the Regina, Long Lake and Saskatchewan was 25 per cent higher than No. 270, so that in asking for a standard 10 per cent higher than No. 270 the company is not making an unreasonable request. In other words, it asks the approval of the board to a standard 17½ per cent higher than the standard enjoyed by the three large western lines from 1902 to August 31, 1914.

Passenger Fares.

"If the Canadian Northern Railway feels that it can lose money in northern Alberta by charging the same rate of fare as in the well settled province of Ontario, it does not follow that another line should have to do the same. For about 50 miles from Edmonton the Edmonton, Dunvegan and British Columbia Railway and the Canadian Northern Railway run close together, and if the former line wants to meet the competitive conditions of the latter, I presume it can do so or disregard them, and this refers to freight and passenger traffic.

"All of which is respectfully submitted.

"(Sgd.) A. MACDONALD."

The Edmonton-Dunvegan line runs north out of Edmonton through a country almost entirely similar to that in which the Athabaska branch of the Canadian Northern is built. During the whole of the western rates case, no suggestion was made that a different scale should be applied on this branch other than the regular scale applying on other branches and main lines of the company. It is, of course, a fact that the board has recognized that in certain instances a higher rate on branch lines may be charged than on main lines; but no case was attempted to be made out in connection with the Athabaska branch. Some 70 miles out of Edmonton it may be, however, the traffic conditions on the Edmonton-Dunvegan may be different from those on the Canadian Northern, as the line may be particularly affected by the Lesser Slave Lake Forest Reserve, as pointed out by Mr. MacDonald in his letter.

I am extremely loath to raise scales in the west. It is idle to hope for a finality in freight rates, but there should be some element of permanency; and, there is, of course, no room for the contention that, as a matter of fact, the railway is constructed in mountainous territory. The only argument for taking the mountain scale as applicable to the railway in question would seem that it needs the money, and that the mountain scale is higher than the prairie scale. The application of the mountain scale as such would not, of course, be justified.

On the other hand, Mr. MacDonald has had much experience in western rates, and is very familiar with western conditions. Not only is he familiar with the conditions, but he enjoys the confidence of the shippers to a large degree. He appeared during the western rates case as rate expert for the provinces of Alberta and Saskatchewan. Although it is true that he is here acting for the railway, he is particularly well qualified to speak as to the needs of this particular section of Alberta.

My first impression was that the board should decline sanction to any rate except the regular scale. Under the particular circumstances of the case, and in view of Mr. MacDonald's claims, I think that the tariffs filed should be approved, with the qualification that such approval does not bind the board in the slightest as to the reasonableness of the charges. The approval will also be merely temporary.

A sitting of the board will be arranged for Edmonton either in the month of May or June, when evidence will be taken by the board as to traffic conditions and operation, and every opportunity given to shippers in Edmonton and the district in question to present their views.

As Mr. MacDonald points out, the Alberta Government is interested in the question to the extent of apparently the sum of $8,000,000 of guarantees, and may desire to take part in the case. All parties will have ample time in which to prepare any submissions they desire to make.

Of course, the adoption of even the tariffs as filed on the higher scale will mean a great reduction in the rates charged. For example, the rate charged Mr. Hunt, $32.54, would, under the tariffs filed and now approved, have only amounted to $10.44.

Commissioner McLean concurred.

COMPLAINT OF E. W. ROBERTS, MONTREAL, AGAINST REFUSAL OF THE C.P.R. CO., TO ESTABLISH A SPECIAL WINTER FREIGHT RATE ON "ROUGH, UNPEELED PULPWOOD," AND REQUESTING THE ASSISTANCE OF THE BOARD IN SECURING SUCH A RATE.

Judgment, Mr. Commissioner McLean, March 29, 1915:—

In the complaint as launched by the applicant, reference was made to the fact that there was a large amount of green, unrossed wood available for pulp manufacture.

Pulpwood is variously defined with reference to the stage and method of preparation. It may be shipped green, with the bark on, i.e., in the "rough." It may be peeled, i.e., the wood is peeled in the spring when the tree is felled. Or it may be rossed, in which case it is peeled and prepared by machinery. In his complaint as launched, the applicant makes a comparison in weights as between the "green, unrossed wood" and the "peeled and partly seasoned" wood. But in his reply to the answer of the railway company he, in dealing with the comparison of weights, refers to the difference in weight between "a cord of unseasoned, rough wood and a cord of seasoned, rossed wood."

In the application and in the supplemental statements a variety of descriptive adjectives are used by the applicant to differentiate two types of pulpwood. One type is variously described as green, unrossed, rough, unseasoned, while the other is, in one connection, described as peeled and partly seasoned, and in another connection as seasoned, rossed wood. The distinction in reality turns upon the difference in

weight due to the degree of seasoning, and the two kinds of wood may, therefore, be sufficiently described as unseasoned and seasoned.

The applicant states that one ton of pulp is obtainable from a cord of wood. The green, unrossed wood weighs about 5,000 pounds to the cord, while the rossed wood weighs approximately three-fifths of this. There is some dispute as to the figures, the railway stating that the unrossed wood weighs from 4,500 to 5,000 pounds, and the applicant, in a subsequent letter on file, stating that the rossed wood, when seasoned, represents a weight of 3,400 pounds. It is apparent that there is a considerable margin in the weight as between the unseasoned wood and the seasoned wood.

The applicant states that there is a large amount of this unrossed wood which is owned by operators of small means, who are unable to obtain capital to cut and ross the wood and wait until it is sufficiently seasoned; and he is of opinion that a special rate on unrossed wood would be justifiable. His application, therefore, is for a special winter freight rate on the unrossed wood, to be applicable until May 10. What is asked for is that the rate should be exactly the same per car as a similar carlot would amount to for the rossed wood during that period.

Under the tariffs, a car under thirty-five feet in length, loaded with pulpwood, on a shipment to a point in the United States, to which destination the applicant desired to ship, has a minimum of 35,000 pounds. When a car is over thirty-five feet in length, there is a minimum of 40,000 pounds. The seasoned wood, when loaded to the minimum, would represent 10·3 and 11·2 cords respectively; this, on the basis of 3,400 pounds. Taking the unseasoned wood at the basis of 5,000 pounds to the cord, this would represent 7 and 8 cords respectively.

In support of this contention, the applicant says that if the railway met the shipper and purchaser halfway, and consented to haul the extra amount of water as contained in the unseasoned wood, it being stated this extra amount of water can be of no value to either of the parties concerned, the railway would obtain additional traffic. It is stated that to-day the up-keep, overhead charges, and running charges of the railway are the same in every respect when the engine is hauling a full load as when it is hauling one-tenth of a load, and that the only item which would be affected is the coal cost. It is stated, further that from the standpoint of the shippers and producers, scattered along the lines of the different railways, there are numbers of settlers who at present are unable to afford to contract for large quantities of wood and erect a rossing plant; and that if the tariff was adjusted as requested, the small contractor would be able to sell his product.

The matter was set down for hearing, Subsequent to the hearing an application, modified in some respects, but widened in others, was put in, the applicant setting out his request as follows:

> "We request a flat car rate for all unseasoned pulpwood, fire-wood, or any soft wood timber whatsoever, not sawn or manufactured, the weight of which shall exceed 3,400 pounds to the cord of 128 cubic feet at the time of shipment. This rate to apply during any season of the year."

In explanation of this, it was stated that, under this arrangement, the weight of the wood alone would decide the tariff rate, so that wood weighing 3,400 pounds to the cord will come under the flat-car rate, and wood weighing less than 3,400 pounds will be charged at the present rate per cord.

The applicant further amended the original application by stating that he did not see why the rate asked for should not prevail during the summer as well as the winter months, and further stated that the scarcity of wood within a resonable distance of, say, Watertown, N.Y., makes a change in the present basis of freight rate imperative.

The matter was taken up with the railways and the board has received a further communication from the applicant, in reply to the answer of the railway, summarizing his position as follows:—

"1. All rough unseasoned wood used in the manufacture of pulp or paper when bought by cord measurement measuring 128 cubic feet to the cord, whenever the weight of same shall exceed 3,200 pounds the freight on same shall be reckoned by the carload rate instead of by weight.

"2. The price per carload shall be equal in amount to the value in freight of the same car loaded with unseasoned wood on the basis of 3,200 lbs. to the cord, reckoned at the existing rate of freight per 100 lbs. from loading point to point of delivery."

The advantage accruing to the public and to the railroads from this arrangement would be as follows:

"1. It will afford the man with only a small capital who is unable to erect a rossing mill, an opportunity to ship his rough wood to a mill in the United States that can handle said wood, and will thus increase the territory from which wood can profitably be shipped, thus placing the producer and the consumer in more direct communication, and cutting out two or three middlemen's profit.

"2. It will benefit the railroad by increasing the traffic in pulpwood, and where an engine hauls three or four cars, it will provide the same engine with a full load. The increase of freight thus obtained will far exceed the small expenditure for extra coal in transporting the increased weight.

"3. The earning power of the people having wood to sell will be increased. This will in turn benefit the railroads because the increased amount of goods purchased by those people will be hauled by the railroads at their present rate of freight."

The applicant sets out that "when I first made my request to your commission, I had in mind the transportation of wood under my contracts for the season of 1915." He says, however, that on account of the delay necessary in the obtaining of facts for the board, he fears the public cannot receive much benefit during this year, and he asks that the rate arrangement, which he requests, should be directed to be continued for an indefinite period.

While the amended application takes up the question, not only of pulpwood, but also of "firewood, or any soft wood timber whatsoever not sawn or manufactured. . . ." the central point in the application, whether the original or the amended application is considered, is the rate on the unseasoned pulpwood.

The larger railway systems of Canada, including the Canadian Pacific, did away with the system of assessing charges on cordwood on the cord basis some years before the board was organized.

The applicant takes the necessity of the shipper of the unseasoned wood as a measure of what the rate should be.

The obligation of the railway is to charge a reasonable rate. It has, however, so often been set out—that it is not necessary to labour it here—that it is not the obligation of the railway to equalize the disadvantages of the shipper from the standpoint of costs of production.

Canadian Portland Cement Co. *v.* G.T.R. and Bay of Quinte Ry. Co. 9 Can. Ry. Cas. 211.

See also Canadian China Clay Co. *v.* C.P.R. *et al,* File No. 24988.

The applicant desires a readjustment of the rates to equalize the disadvantage in point of ownership of capital of those shipping the unrossed wood as compared with those shipping the rossed wood. The initial making of the rates is in the hands of the transportation agency. It is not the board's function, as delegated by parliament,

to make rates to develop business, but to deal with the reasonableness of rates either on complaint or of its own motion.

> British Columbia News Co. *v.* Express Traffic Association, 13 Can. Ry. Cas. 178.

A further question is concerned with the detail of the arrangement which the applicant asks for as to weight.

The application as amended in the latest statement of the applicant sets out that 3,200 pounds shall be the basis; that the existing rate shall apply; and that, in respect of any addition in weight per cord of the unseasoned wood over and above this 3,200 pounds, there shall not be any additional charge by the railway—that is to say, if, for the hauling of 10 cords of seasoned wood weighing 32,000 pounds, a certain return is received by the railway, then for the hauling of 10 cords of unseasoned wood weighing 50,000 pounds, the same return shall be received by the railway. That is to say, that in aid of the wood which is of greater weight, the railway shall charge the same rate as on the lower weight, thereby hauling 18,000 pounds without any additional charge.

In the application of the Blaugas Company for a rearrangement of its classification rating, the question of the weight of the cylinders used in transporting the gas was referred to; and the board stated, 12 Can. Ry. Cas., 304:—

> "The Blaugas Company also referred to the weight of the steel cylinder in which the blaugas was shipped, it being testified that a cylinder when full of the gas weighed 120 lbs., and that the cylinder empty weighed 100; and it apparently was the opinion of the company that the tare connected with the transportation of the gas should be considered. So far as the question of the weight of the cylinder is concerned, the board, in my opinion, would not be justified in considering this as a reason for a reduction in the outgoing rating of the cylinders when full. In reality, the heavier container used in connection with this gas as compared with the gasolene container is one of the incidents of the business. In this respect they may be said to have a higher cost of production, so far as the laying down of the commodity is concerned, and it would not be fair to ask the railway to equalize the differences in cost of production."

In the application of L'Air Liquide Society, File No. 19367-16, in regard to the matter of the classification of oxygen gas, reference was made by the applicant to the fact that oxygen gas was shipped in steel cylinders, averaging empty 100 lbs. each, full 108 or 109; and in the report of the board's chief traffic officer, upon which order issued, the following language is to be found:

> "The preponderant weight of the container is an unavoidable trade encumbrance, which while accentuated in the case of gas accompanies with greater or less relative tare all packed articles of commerce, and cannot be differentiated in freight classification."

The situation in connection with the present application is analogous in respect of the difference between the weight of the seasoned wood and the weight of the unseasoned wood. This is a situation for which the railway is in no way responsible.

On what is stated by the applicant, the disadvantage as to the shipment of the unseasoned wood is a disadvantage which arises from the fact that the shippers have not sufficient capital to ross wood and hold it until it is more seasoned. This, then, is a situation for which the railway is not responsible.

The established basis of rate-making, so far as the unit is concerned, is 100 lbs.; and the unit having been so established, charges vary with weight. While the rate for a carlot quantity is differentiated from the rate for a less than carlot quantity, the basis is still 100 lbs. It is recognized that to quote a carlot rate without indicating the weight that is to go on the car would create discriminatory conditions. A carload

quantity calls for a rate based on a certain minimum. Then above this minimum and limited by the maximum loading of the car, the payment for the movement of the car varies with the weight. What is asked for here is that the weight of 5,000 lbs. or a multiple thereof, shall be treated as if it were a weight of 3,200 lbs., or a multiple thereof,—that is to say, an additional weight of 56 per cent is to be carried without being charged for.

The pulpwood rate has not been attacked as unreasonable. The board is not justified in directing the extension which is asked for as to the obligation of the railways in respect of the weight which is to be carried for this rate.

Assistant Chief Commissioner Scott, and Deputy Chief Commissioner Nantel concurred.

APPENDIX "D."

SIR,—I have the honour to submit for the tenth report of the Board, a memorandum of the freight, passenger, express, telephone, telegraph and sleeping and parlour car schedules filed with the Board from November 1, 1904, to March 31, 1914, and from April 1, 1914, to March 31, 1915, inclusive; also of the more important orders relating to traffic issued by the Board from April 1, 1914, to March 31, 1915.

SCHEDULES RECEIVED FROM NOVEMBER 1, 1904, TO AND INCLUDING MARCH 31, 1914.

FREIGHT—			
Local tariffs	7,253		
Supplements	16,672	23,925	
Joint tariffs	15,028		
Supplements	49,842	64,870	
International tariffs	62,548		
Supplements	205,594	268,142	
			356,937
PASSENGER—			
Local tariffs	6,270		
Supplements	6,818	13,088	
Joint tariffs	3,375		
Supplements	6,157	9,532	
International tariffs	10,968		
Supplements	15,528	26,496	
			49,116
EXPRESS—			
Local tariffs	4,673		
Supplements	49,992	54,665	
Joint tariffs	2,694		
Supplements	10,587	13,281	
International tariffs	1,766		
Supplements	956	2,722	
			70,668
TELEPHONE—			
Local tariffs	908		
Supplements	844	1,752	
Joint tariffs	2,018		
Supplements	2,925	4,943	
International tariffs	426		
Supplements	4,795	5,221	
			11,916
TELEGRAPH—			
Tariffs	89		
Supplements	86		175
SLEEPING AND PARLOUR CAR—			
Local tariffs	52		
Supplements	44	96	
Joint tariffs	25		
Supplements	41	66	
International tariffs	35		
Supplements	66	101	
			263
Combined totals, all schedules			489,075

SESSIONAL PAPER No. 20c

SCHEDULES RECEIVED FROM APRIL 1, 1914, TO AND INCLUDING MARCH 31, 1915.

FREIGHT—			
Local tariffs	1,257		
Supplements	2,383	3,640	
Joint tariffs	3,065		
Supplements	6,240	9,305	
International tariffs	17,190		
Supplements	40,603	57,793	
			70,738
PASSENGER—			
Local tariffs	1,436		
Supplements	2,139	3,575	
Joint tariffs	1,322		
Supplements	2,178	3,500	
International tariffs	2,060		
Supplements	5,502	7,562	
			14,637
EXPRESS—			
Local tariffs	122		
Supplements	1,691	1,813	
Joint tariffs	776		
Supplements	1,071	1,847	
International tariffs	1		
Supplements	3	4	
			3,664
TELEPHONE—			
Local tarifs	4		
Supplements	28	32	
Joint tariffs	203		
Supplements	1,609	1,812	
International tariffs	1		
Supplements	1,013	1,014	
			2,858
TELEGRAPH—			
Tariffs	10		
Supplements	13		23
SLEEPING AND PARLOUR CAR—			
Local tariffs	4		
Supplements	14	18	
Joint tariffs	3		
Supplements	19	22	
International tariffs	9		
Supplements	48	57	
			97
Combined totals, all schedules			92,017
GRAND TOTAL			581,092

SUMMARY OF TRAFFIC ORDERS OF GENERAL INTEREST ISSUED DURING THE YEAR ENDED MARCH 31, 1915.

No. 21566, April 1, 1914.—Approves the Montreal and Southern Counties Ry. Co.'s Standard Tariff of Maximum Mileage Tolls for freight traffic, C.R.C. No. 1.

No. 21629, April 11, 1914.—Enlarges the express collection and delivery limits in the city of Regina, Sask., as fixed by Order No. 14906, September 14, 1911.

No. 21686, April 22, 1914.—Disallows increased rates by the railway companies operating from Windsor, Ont., on caustic soda and bleaching powder, in carloads, manufactured at Sandwich, Ont.

No. 21743, April 20, 1914.—Approves an agreement between the Bell Telephone Company and the Municipal Corporation of the township of Brighton, dated March 31, 1914, for the interchange of telephone services.

No. 21746, May 4, 1914.—Disallows an increased rate of the Grand Trunk Railway Company on clay for manufacturing purposes, from Waterdown to Swansea and Mimico, Ont.

No. 21765, May 6, 1914.—Approves Supplement No. 4 to the Express Classification for Canada, No. 3.

No. 21777, May 2, 1914.—Approves an agreement between the Bell Telephone Company and the Byron Telephone Company for the interchange of telephone services.

No. 21781, May 7, 1914.—On rehearing the Dominion Sugar Company of Wallaceburg, Ont., granted reduced rates on sugar, in carloads, from Wallaceburg to Toronto and Hamilton, of 10½ cents and 11½ cents per 100 pounds respectively, on an increased minimum load of 40,000 pounds per car.

No. 21786, May 8, 1914.—Disallows certain notices of the railway companies entering Windsor, Ont., debarring industries on the Essex Terminal Railway Company from joint through rates on Windsor basis on international traffic.

No. 21789, May 12, 1914.—The Grand Trunk, Canadian Pacific and Canadian Northern Railway Companies, having increased their rates to Montreal on lumber, for local delivery and for export, for the season of 1913, directed to reinstate the "export" rates of 1912 from Pembroke, Waltham, Maniwaki and intermediate north and south shore shipping points, including Ottawa and Hull.

No. 21802, May 13, 1914.—Approves an agreement between the Bell Telephone Company and the Pontiac Rural Telephone Company for the interchange of telephone services.

No. 21877, May 26, 1914.—Canadian Northern Express Company, to publish joint rates on fruit and vegetables from Prince Edward County to points beyond or via Smiths Falls, in connection with the Canadian and Dominion Express Companies, not to exceed the rates of these latter companies from the Niagara District to the same destinations.

No. 21899, May 26, 1914.—Grand Trunk Railway Company given operating privileges on the spur line of the Toronto, Hamilton and Buffalo Railway Company, to the National Steel Car Company's plant at Hamilton.

No. 21903, May 29, 1914.—Approves an agreement for interchange of telephone services between the Bell Telephone Co. and the Alanwick Rural Telephone Co.

No. 125 (general order) May 30, 1914.—Gives effect to the terms of the judgment, dated April 6, 1914, in what is known as the Western Rates Case.

No. 21943, June 5, 1914.—Authorizes the opening of a portion of the Essex Terminal Railway as a connection for through traffic between the Canadian Pacific Railway and the Michigan Central Railway routed via the Windsor-Detroit tunnel.

No. 21946, June 2, 1914.—Approves an agreement for interchange of telephone services between the Bell Telephone Company and the Bobcaygeon Rural Telephone Company.

No. 21947, June 4, 1914.—Extends the express collection and delivery limits at Banff, Alberta, as fixed by Order No. 18740, dated February 20, 1913.

No. 21958, June 8, 1914.—Reduces the joint rate of the Canadian Pacific and Grand Trunk Railway Companies on coke from the Consumer's Gas Company's siding at Toronto to North Toronto from 95 cents to 65 cents per net ton.

No. 21980, June 8, 1914.—Approves an agreement for interchange of telephone services between the Bell Telphone Co. and the King Telephone Company.

No. 21981, June 13, 1914.—Defines express collection and delivery limits in the town of Morse, Sask.

No. 22007, June 8, 1914.—Approves an agreement for interchange of telephone services between the Bell Telephone Co. and the municipal corporation of the township of Brooke.

No. 22013, June 17, 1914.—Approves, with certain additions, Supplement No. 3 to the Canadian Freight Classification No. 16.

No. 22036, June 17, 1914.—Approves an agreement for interchange of telephone services between the Bell Telephone Co. and the Caradoc-Ekfrid Telephone Co.

No. 22127, July 2, 1914.—Joint order of the Board of Railway Commissioners for Canada and the Ontario Railway and Municipal Board, apportioning between the Grand Trunk and the Galt, Preston and Hespeler Street Railway Co. the costs of installations of interchange tracks at Galt, Preston, Berlin and Waterloo, Ont., as provided by Order No. 17064, July 5, 1912.

No. 22063, June 25, 1914.—Extends the period fixed by Order No. 20942, dated December 1, 1913, for the approval of the Canadian Pacific Railway Company's Telegraph tolls until December 1, 1914.

No. 22064, June 25, 1914.—Extends the period fixed by Order No. 20946, dated December 1, 1913, for the approval of the Great North Western Telegraph Company's tolls until December 1, 1914.

No. 22067, June 25, 1914.—Extends the period fixed by Order No. 20950, dated December 1, 1913, for the approval of the White Pass and Yukon companies route's telegraph tolls until December 1, 1914.

No. 22068, June 25, 1914.—Extends the period fixed by Order No. 20951, dated December 1, 1913, for the approval of the Grand Trunk Pacific Telegraph tolls until December 1, 1914.

No. 23115, July 3, 1914.—Approves an agreement for the interchange of telephone services between the Bell Telephone Company and the Harrietsville Telephone Association, Limited.

No. 22162, July 6, 1914.—Approves an agreement for the interchange of telephone services between the Bell Telephone Co. and the Alice Telephone Company, Limited.

No. 22163, July 7, 1914.—Approves an agreement for the interchange of telephone services between the Bell Telephone Company and the Wallacetown and Lake Shore Telephone Association, Limited.

No. 22189, July 10, 1914.—Restores a special interswitching toll of three dollars per car to be charged by the Grand Trunk Railway Company for interchanging traffic between the Grand Trunk railway and the town spur at Fergus, Ont., as fixed by special contract between the parties.

No. 22200, July 11, 1914.—Prohibits the carriage by express of liquid and scrap celluloid, and prescribes the conditions under which articles composed wholly or partly of celluloid may be carried by express companies.

No. 22220, July 16, 1914.—Extends the Toronto rate to York, Ont., on coal from Detroit and Niagara Frontier gateways.

No. 22228, July 20, 1914.—Amends the judgment of the board in the western rates case, so-called, by substituting Thornton for Hinton as the point of juncture of the "Prairie" and "Mountain" rate scales of the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway Company.

No. 22230, July 20, 1914.—Prescribes express collection and delivery limits in the town of Miles, Sask.

No. 22231, June 30, 1914.—Amends Order No. 19849, May 30, 1913, by extending the free area therein defined for the collection and delivery of express freight at St. Boniface, Man.

No. 22237, July 18, 1914.—Requires the Grand Trunk and Canadian Pacific railway companies to provide special tariffs of "arbitrary" rates to apply within Canada on through shipments of lumber from points south of the Ohio and Potomac rivers.

No. 22246, July 22, 1914.—Extends the limits fixed by Order No. 13413 of December 31, 1912, for the free collection and delivery of express freight at Winnipeg, Man.

No. 129 (General Order) July 22, 1914.—No toll contained in any special or competitive freight or express tariff to be advanced until it has been in force at least thirty days. Applications for suspension or postponement of any increased rate or charge to be filed with the board at least fourteen days before the date when the said rate or charge is proposed to become effective, provided that this requirement may be varied by the board of its own motion or on special grounds advanced.

No. 22315, August 4, 1914.—Extends the limits fixed by Order No. 19533 of June 9, 1913, for the free collection and delivery of express freight at Windsor, Ont.

No. 22337, August 5, 1914.—Approves standard maximum freight tariff C.R.C. No. W-793 to apply from September 1, 1914, locally between stations on the lines of the Canadian Northern Railway Company west of and including Port Arthur in the provinces of Manitoba, Saskatchewan and Alberta.

No. 22374, August 10, 1914.—Extends the limits fixed by Orders Nos. 14906 and 21629 for the free collection and delivery of express freight at Regina, Sask.

No. 22412, August 17, 1914.—Approves standard maximum freight tariff C.R.C. No. 1948 to apply from September 1, 1914, locally between stations and ports of call on the Canadian Pacific Railway Company's lines west of and including Port Arthur in the provinces of Manitoba, Saskatchewan, Alberta and British Columbia.

No. 22419, August 20, 1914.—Approves standard maximum tariff C.R.C. No. 4439 chargeable between the Dominion Express Company's offices in Vancouver Island.

No. 22454, August 14, 1914.—The Algoma Central Railway Company ordered to continue, by the restoration of cancelled tariffs, the use and maintenance of its wharf facilities, at Michipicoten, Ont., to accommodate traffic offering at that point.

No. 22456, August 17, 1914.—Approves supplement No. 6 to the express classification for Canada No. 3.

No. 22474, August 31, 1914.—Approves standard maximum freight tariff C.R.C. No. 22, to apply from September 1, 1914, locally between stations on the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway Company's lines west of and including Port Arthur in the provinces of Ontario, Manitoba, Saskatchewan and British Columbia.

No. 22482, August 31, 1914.—Approves an agreement for the interchange of telephone services between the Bell Telephone Company and the Municipal Corporation of the township of Waterloo, Ont.

No. 22486, September 1, 1914.—Approves an agreement for the interchange of telephone services between the Bell Telephone Company and the Muskoka, Victoria and Haliburton Telephone Company, Limited.

No. 22490, September 4, 1914.—Approves Standard Maximum Freight Tariffs C.R.C. Nos. 1057 to 1063, inclusive, to apply from September 1, 1914, locally between stations on the Great Northern Railway Company's lines in Manitoba and British Columbia.

No. 22497, September 3, 1914.—Approves an agreement for the interchange of telephone services between the Bell Telephone Company and the Thedford, Arkona and East Lambton Telephone Company, Limited.

No. 22498, September 3, 1914.—Approves an agreement for the interchange of telephone services between the Bell Telephone Company and the Lambton Telephone Company, Limited.

No. 22544, September 14, 1914.—Approves an agreement for the interchange of telephone services between the Bell Telephone Company and the Huntsville and Lake of Bays Telephone Company, Limited.

No. 22547, September 14, 1914.—Approves an agreement for the interchange of telephone services between the Bell Telephone Company and the Second Line Drummond Telephone Company, Limited.

No. 22572, September 17, 1914.—Approves an agreement for the interchange of telephone services between the Bell Telephone Company and the Municipal Corporation of the township of Pelee.

No. 22591, September 22, 1914.—Approves International Bridge and Terminal Company's Standard Maximum Freight Tariff, C.R.C. No. 1.

No. 22607, September 23, 1914.—Approves British Columbia Electric Railway Company's Standard Maximum Freight Tariff, C.R.C. No. 23, to apply between the company's statious on the Vancouver and Lulu Island Railway and the Vancouver, Fraser Valley and Southern railway.

No. 22632, September 21, 1914.—Extends the Dominion Express Co.'s free cartage limits at Swift Current, Sask., as fixed by Order No. 20463, September 30, 1913.

No. 132 (General Order) October 2, 1914.—Restores mixed carload arrangements with respect to groceries and dried fruits, also foreign and native liquors, to destinations west of and including Port Arthur, said arrangements having been cancelled by the carriers September 1, 1914.

No. 22652, September 30, 1914.—Approves an agreement for the interchange of telephone services between the Bell Telephone Company and the Burnt River Telephone Company, Limited.

No. 22657, October 2, 1914.—Approves Canadian Northern Railway Company's Standard Maximum Freight Tariff, C.R.C. No. 513, to apply between stations on the company's lines east of Port Arthur, Ont.

No. 22664, October 6, 1914.—Prescribes reduced commodity rates on cobble, crushed, field and rubble stone from Grand Trunk Windmill Point siding to points on the Grand Trunk Railway and Michigan Central R.R., in the Niagara district.

No. 22705, October 13, 1914.—Approves Standard Maximum Freight Tariff, C.R.C. No. E-1, of the Express Department of the Halifax and South Western Railway Company.

No. 22720, October 13, 1914.—Approves an agreement for the interchange of telephone services between the Bell Telephone Company and the Sparta Rural Telephone Company, Limited.

No. 22777, October 27, 1914.—Approves an agreement for the interchange of telephone services between the Bell Telephone Company and the South Ham Telephone Company, Limited.

No. 22779, October 28, 1914.—Approves Standard Maximum Freight Tariff, C.R.C. No. 268, of the Esquimalt and Nanaimo Railway Co.

No. 22798, October 31, 1914.—Approves Great Northern Railway Company's Standard Maximum Freight Tariff, C.R.C. No. V-36, applying between stations on the Victoria and Sidney railway.

No. 22802, November 3, 1914.—Defines the area at Kentville, N.S., within which the tolls of the Dominion Express Company include collection and delivery.

No. 22821, November 2, 1914.—Approves an agreement for the interchange of telephone services between the Bell Telephone Company and the Chapleau Rural Telephone Company, Limited.

No. 22834, November 7, 1914.—Defines the area at Red Deer, Alberta, within which the tolls of the Dominion Express Company include collection and delivery.

No. 22860, November 10, 1914.—Approves an agreement for the interchange of telephone services between the Bell Telephone Company and the Municipal Corporation of the township of Thessalon.

No. 22864, November 12, 1914.—Approves an agreement for the interchange of telephone services between the Bell Telephone Company and La Compagnie Telephone St. Paul de Chester.

No. 22873, November 16, 1914.—Approves Standard Maximum Freight Tariff, C.R.C. No. 3, of the Express Department of the Montreal and Southern Counties Railway Company to apply between Montreal and Longueuil and intermediate points.

No. 22874, November 16, 1914.—Approves an agreement for the interchange of telephone service between the Bell Telephone Company and La Compagnie de Téléphone Electrique de Lotbinière.

No. 22895, November 25, 1914.—Approves Supplement No. 4 to the Canadian Freight Classification No. 16.

No. 22901, November 25, 1914.—Further extends, until July 1, 1915, the time limited by section 4, chapter 61, 7-8 Edward VII, for the approval of tolls for the transmission of messages between points in Canada west of and including Sudbury, also between points west of Sudbury and points east thereof and east of and including Windsor, Ont., charged by the Canadian Pacific Railway Company's telegraphs.

No. 22902, November 25, 1914.—Further extends, until July 1, 1915, the time limited by section 4, chapter 61, 7-8 Edward VII, for the approval of tolls for the transmission of messages between points in Canada west of North Bay, also between points west of North Bay and points east thereof and east of and including Windsor, Ont., charged by the Great North Western Telegraph Company of Canada.

No. 22903, November 25, 1914.—Further extends, until July 1, 1915, the time limited by section 4, chapter 61, 7-8 Edward VII, for the approval of tolls for the transmission of messages between points in Canada except between local offices on the Ottawa division, and between them and Swanton, Vermont, charged by the Grand Trunk Pacific Telegraph Company.

No. 22904, November 25, 1914.—Further extends, until July 1, 1915, the time limited by section 4, chapter 61, 7-8 Edward VII, for the approval of tolls for the transmission of messages between points in Canada, charged by the White Pass and Yukon route.

No. 22921, November 26, 1914.—Approves Standard Maximum Freight Tariff, C.R.C. No. 27, of the Kettle Valley Railway Company, to apply between its stations in British Columbia.

No. 22949, December 3, 1914.—Approves Standard Maximum Passenger Tariff, C.R.C. No. E-488, of the Canadian Northern Railway Company to apply between the company's stations east of and including Port Arthur, in the provinces of Ontario and Quebec, on the basis of three cents per mile.

No. 22953, December 2, 1914.—Approves an agreement for the interchange of telephone services between the Bell Telephone Company and La Compagnie Telephone Local de Ham Nor.

No. 22955, December 4, 1914.—Approves Standard Maximum Freight Tariff, C.R.C. No. F-1, of the Halifax and South Western Railway Company.

No. 22962, December 4, 1914.—Approves Standard Maximum Passenger Tariff, C.R.C. No. P-1, of the Halifax and South Western Railway Company on the basis of three cents per mile.

No. 22973, December 7, 1914.—Sanctions certain minor changes in and additions to the express merchandise receipt previously prescribed by the board.

No. 22976, December 10, 1914.—Defines the limits of the area at St. Jerome, Que., within which the tolls of the Dominion Express Company include collection and delivery.

No. 22991, December 17, 1914.—Defines delivery limits for express freight at Lacombe, Alberta.

No. 23008, December 11, 1914.—Approves an agreement for the interchange of telephone services between the Bell Telephone Company and the Municipal Corporation of the village of Brussels.

No. 23011, December 17, 1914.—Approves an agreement for the interchange of telephone services between the Bell Telephone Company and the Princeton and Drumbo Telephone Company, Limited.

No. 133 (General Order), December 19, 1914.—Suspends the proposed cancellation by the railway companies, January 1, 1915, of the arrangements whereby mixed carloads of foreign liquors, and mixed carloads of groceries, classified fifth class in straight carloads, and dried fruits, classified fourth class in straight carloads, are carried at their respective carload rates between points west of and including Port Arthur, and thereto from eastern shipping points.

No. 23022, December 23, 1914.—Defines collection and delivery limits for express freight at Cobalt, Ontario.

No. 23116, January 9, 1915.—Approves an agreement for the interchange of telephone services between the Bell Telephone Company and the Central Dufferin Telephone Association, Limited.

No. 23137, January 11, 1915.—Approves an agreement for the interchange of telephone services between the Bell Telephone Company and the Canadian Telephone Company.

No. 23138, January 13, 1915.—Approves an agreement for the interchange of telephone services between the Bell Telephone Company and the municipality of the township of Dover.

No. 23197, January 23, 1915.—Approves an agreement for the interchange of telephone services between the Bell Telephone Company and the Elmsley South Rural Telephone Company.

No. 134 (General Order), January 25, 1915.—Requires railway companies west of Lake Superior, before receiving authority for the carriage of traffic on any extension of their existing railway systems, in addition to the standard tariffs, to publish and file the appropriate supplementary special class or "town" tariffs, mileage commodity tariffs, special tariffs on grain to the Lake Superior terminals, and on lumber from British Columbia, as these may be applicable to the territories to be served by the said new lines.

No. 23243, February 1, 1915—Approves an agreement for the interchange of telephone services between the Bell Telephone Company and the Roman Catholic Episcopal corporation of the diocese of Kingston.

No. 23244, February 1, 1915.—Approves an agreement for the interchange of telephone services between the Bell Telephone Company and the Plummer, Aberdeen and Galbraith Rural Telephone Association, Limited.

No. 23246, February 4, 1915.—Approves an agreement for the interchange of telephone services between the Bell Telephone Company and the Apsley Telephone Company.

No. 23255, February 5, 1915.—Defines the area within which the express companies shall make free collection and delivery services in Fort Frances, Ont.

No. 23256, February 5, 1915.—Approves an agreement for the interchange of telephone services between the Bell Telephone Company and the Thamesville Telephone Company, Limited.

No. 23263, February 6, 1915.—Approves an agreement for the interchange of telephone services between the Bell Telephone Company and the Katevale Telephone Company.

No. 23332, February 23, 1915.—Prescribes basis for joint lumber rates between the Western Canada Power Company's railway and the Canadian Pacific railway, via Ruskin, B.C.

No. 23351, February 23, 1915.—Approves an agreement for the interchange of telephone services between the Bell Telephone Company and the Sunderland Telephone Company, Limited.

No. 23352, February 23, 1915.—Approves an agreement for the interchange of telephone services between the Bell Telephone Company and the Stroud Telephone Company, Ltd.; the municipal corporation of the township of Johnson, and the municipal corporation of the township of Tarbutt and Tarbutt additional.

No. 23362, February 25, 1915.—Approves an agreement for the interchange of telephone services between the Bell Telephone Company and the municipal corporation of the village of Blyth.

No. 23364, February 27, 1915.—Approves an agreement for the interchange of telephone services between the Bell Telephone Company and the municipal corporation

of the township of Laird, and rescinds Order No. 9653, dated February 21, 1910, approving a previous agreement.

No. 23368, March 1, 1915.—Approves an agreement for the interchange of telephone services between the Bell Telephone Company and the Tarentrous Telephone Company, Limited, and rescinds Order No. 12251, dated November 11, 1910, approving a previous agreement.

No. 23375, February 26, 1915.—Grand Trunk and Canadian Northern railway companies jointly required to publish a tariff of joint rates on coal from Prescott, Ont., ex-United States, to all points on that portion of the Canadian Northern Railway Company's line formerly known as the Brockville, Westport and Northwestern railway, via Lyn.

No. 23392, March 4, 1915.—Canadian Pacific Railway Company, required to accept shipments of perishable freight in heated cars during the winter season on all its lines west of Port Arthur, and prescribing the terms and conditions of carriage.

No. 23414, March 13, 1915.—Approves an agreement for the interchange of telephone services between the Bell Telephone Company and the West Garafraxa Telephone Co-operative Association, Limited.

No. 135 (General Order), Mar 22, 1915.—Establishes bases for commodity rates on newsprint paper, in carloads, from manufacturing points in Eastern Canada to points west of Fort William.

No. 23444, March 23, 1915.—Approves an agreement for the interchange of telephone services between the Bell Telephone Company and the Ayr Rural Telephone Company, Limited.

No. 23447, March 12, 1915.—Approves Standard Passenger Tariff, C.R.C., No. 1, of the Hull Electric Company.

No. 23455, March 24, 1915.—Approves an agreement for the interchange of telephone services between the Bell Telephone Company and the East Gray Telephone Company, Limited.

No. 23461, March 24, 1915.—Approves an agreement for the interchange of telephone services between the Bell Telephone Company and the Wakefield and Masham Telephone Company.

No. 136 (General Order), March 25, 1915.—Approves an amended form of special contract, or "release" limiting the responsibility of carriers in connection with the carriage of household goods, furniture and settlers' effects (second-hand).

No. 137 (General Order), March 26, 1915.—Approves an amendment to the express classification for Canada No. 3, providing a basis of charges for storage batteries, also conditions of carriage thereof.

No. 138 (General Order), March 25, 1915.—Approves an amendment to the express classification for Canada No. 3, providing a basis of charges for moving picture films, also conditions of carriage thereof.

I have the honour to be, sir,

Your obedient servant,

J. HARDWELL.

APPENDIX "E."

LIST OF INSPECTIONS MADE BY THE ENGINEERING DEPARTMENT FROM APRIL 1, 1914, TO MARCH 31, 1915.

April 1.—Inspection of drainage on Campbellford, Lake Ontario and Western railway *re* complaint of P. J. Roach, Cherrywood, Ontario.

April 1.—Inspection of half interlocker at crossing of Great Northern railway by Canadian Pacific railway, Crowsnest branch, at Baynes Lake, B.C.

April 4.—Inspection of interlocking plant at crossing of Canadian Pacific railway, double track, by Grand Trunk railway, single track, at Milton, Ont.

April 7.—Inspection of bridge No. 11·3, Stanbridge subdivision, Quebec, Canadian Pacific railway.

April 9.—Inspection of bridge No. 18·7, St. Gabriel subdivision, Quebec, Canadian Pacific railway.

April 13.—Inspection for removal of speed restrictions on Kootenay Central (C.P.R.), mile 0 to 41.

April 15.—Inspection for traffic of Lethbridge subdivision, bridge 91·1, on Canadian Pacific railway.

April 15.—Inspection for traffic of Lethbridge subdivision, bridge 15·6, on Canadian Pacific railway.

April 15.—Inspection of culvert *re* complaint of lumber company, Kingston and Pembroke subdivision, Clyde Forks, Ont., Canadian Pacific railway.

April 20.—Inspection of interlocking plant at crossing of Canadian Pacific railway on Calgary-Edmonton line by Grand Trunk Pacific railway in the city of Calgary.

April 21.—Inspection for traffic interlocking plant crossing Canadian Pacific railway, section 35-24-27, west 4th meridian, by Canadian Northern railway, Calgary subdivision.

April 22.—Inspection of Cain, Edward, Aaron, Weber and Waterloo street crossings on Grand Trunk railway at Berlin, Ont.

April 24.—Inspection of interlocking plant at crossing of Hamilton Radial railway by the Toronto, Hamilton and Buffalo railway at Barton street, Hamilton, Ont.

April 24.—Inspection of Sherman Inlet drainage on the Grand Trunk railway at Hamilton, Ont.

April 24.—Inspection of Bridge street, Yarker, Ont., *re* complaint of condition of Canadian Northern railway crossing.

April 24.—Inspection of line *re* fencing on the Montfort branch of the Canadian Northern Quebec railway.

April 28.—Inspection for opening for traffic, G.T.P. Railway Company's Young Prince Albert branch, from Wakaw, mile 57 to end of track, mile 87 distance 30 miles.

April 30.—Inspection opening for traffic, Canadian Pacific Railway Company's northeasterly line of double track from mile 0 to 9·92, and second track of the Emerson subdivision from mile 0 to 2·03, and Lac du Bonnet subdivision, second track from Whittier Junction, mile 0 to 2·90.

April 30.—Inspection Canadian Pacific railway *re* interlocking plant where its Brandon branch crosses the tracks of the Canadian Northern Railway Company's Oak Point subdivision, at Woodman, mile 5·6.

April 30.—Inspection of culvert *re* complaint of Lumber Company, Kingston and Pembroke subdivision, Clyde Forks, Ont., of Canadian Pacific railway.

May 1.—Inspection opening for traffic of the Canadian Northern railway, Oak Point branch to Gypsumville, distance 97 miles.

May 2.—Inspection *re* interchange between Canadian Pacific railway and Grand Trunk Pacific at Calgary.

May 4.—Inspection for opening for traffic of the new second track of the Canadian Pacific railway, Swift Current subdivision, mile 109·4 to 110·5, distance 1·1 miles.

May 5.—Inspection of the Canadian Northern railway, Calgary subdivision, *re* culvert in township 31-13-17, west 4th meridian.

May 5.—Inspection for opening for traffic of the Canadian Pacific Railway Company's branch, from Woodrow, mile 145·7 to Shaunavon, mile 230·8, distance 85·1 miles, with a view of removing speed limitation of 18 miles per hour for the first 62 miles, and 10 miles an hour over the remaining 23·1 miles.

May 5.—Inspection of bridge No. 133·28 on the Sudbury subdivision of the Canadian Pacific railway.

May 6.—Inspection of drainage on the Canadian Pacific railway in the township of McDonald near Sault Ste. Marie, Ontario.

May 6.—Inspection of track of the Wabash railroad, Ekfrid, Ont.

May 7.—Inspection of work done at public road crossing on the line of the Grand Trunk railway at Prairie siding, Ontario.

May 7.—Inspection of roadbed of the Canadian Northern Ontario Railway Company, Sudbury to Lake Joseph, Ontario.

May 8.—Inspection of McPherson spur, two miles west of Puslinch, Ont., on the Canadian Pacific railway.

May 8.—Inspection of Canadian Pacific railway siding west of Toronto, Ontario.

May 8.—Inspection of bridges, Middle division, district 15th of the Grand Trunk railway, Ont.

May 11.—Inspection of street crossing on the line of the Canadian Pacific railway, *re* protection asked for by town of Three Rivers, Quebec.

May 12.—Inspection of proposed location of the Lake Erie and Northern railway at Port Dover, Ontario.

May 12.—Inspection of the Great Northern railway *re* subway on Cox street, Fernie, B.C.

May 13.—Inspection of station layout and retaining walls of the Lake Erie and Northern railway at Brantford, Ontario.

May 14.—Inspection of the Canadian Pacific Railway bridge No. 144·4, Portal subdivision *re* replacement of existing timber trestle.

May 14.—Inspection of the Canadian Pacific railway *re* replacement of existing timber trestle over bridge No. 144·8, Portal subdivision.

May 16.—Inspection of the Canadian Pacific railway, new second main line track between St. John and Iberville Junction, St. John, Quebec.

May 16.—Inspection of Canadian Pacific railway, *re* farm crossing for Damase Goyette, Iberville, Quebec.

May 16.—Inspection *re* condition of fences, road crossings, bridges, etc., on the Calgary subdivision of the Canadian Northern railway between Calgary and Drumheller.

May 18.—Inspection of Canadian Northern railway *re* crossing for N. Lalonde, St. Genevieve, Quebec.

May 18.—Inspection for opening for traffic of the Canadian Pacific railway, Snowflake branch, distance 10 miles.

May 19.—Inspection of the southern division of the Quebec, Montreal and Southern railway *re* repairs to bridge and culvert.

May 20.—Inspection of work done at public road, as per Board's order, on the Canadian Pacific railway, Melbourne, Quebec.

May 26.—Inspection of Grand Trunk railway culvert and drainage area of Jackson creek, *re* complaint of farmers of St. Blaise, Que.

May 27.—Inspection of diversion of Thurlow railway under the Campbellford, Lake Ontario and Western railway.

May 27.—Inspection of Campbellford, Lake Ontario and Western railway for opening of traffic.

May 28.—Inspection of crossing of George street, Cobourg, Ontario, by the Campbellford, Lake Ontario and Western railway.

May 28.—Inspection of farm crossing for Mr. Bickle on the Campbellford, Lake Ontario and Western railway.

May 28.—Inspection of Campbellford, Lake Ontario and Western railway *re* protection of freight spurs on Wellington st., Bowmanville, Ont.

May 28.—Inspection of road crossing on Campbellford, Lake Ontario and Western railway at lot 2, concession 3, township of Oso, Ont.

May 28.—Inspection of road crossing on Campbellford, Lake Ontario and Western railway at lot 2, concession 5, township of Oso, Ontario.

May 28.—Inspection of Canadian Pacific Railway Company's culvert and ditch, Port McNicoll subdivision, *re* drainage complaints.

June 4.—Inspection of the Canadian Pacific and Grand Trunk Pacific Railway Companies *re* interchange at Calgary.

June 4.—Inspection of street crossings in town of Oshawa on the line of the Campbellford, Lake Ontario and Western railway.

June 5.—Inspection in connection with complaint of J. N. Neuret, Invermay, Sask., against the Canadian Northern railway, *re* proposed closing crossing at roadway, sections 2 and 11, west 2nd meridian. (Reported Dec. 1, 1914.)

June 6.—Inspection of the Canadian Pacific Railway crossing at mile 112·5, Kerrobert subdivision.

June 6.—Inspection for opening for traffic of bridge 57·4 of the Canadian Pacific railway, Cascade subdivision.

June 6.—Inspection for opening for traffic of bridge 112·2 of the Canadian Pacific railway, Cascade subdivision.

June 6.—Inspection for opening for traffic of bridge 113·5 of the Canadian Pacific railway, Cascade subdivision.

June 6.—Inspection for opening for traffic of bridge 93·5 of the Canadian Pacific railway, Cascade subdivision.

June 8.—Inspection for opening for traffic from Osborne bay to Westholme, 2·5 miles, of the Esquimalt and Nanaimo railway (C.P.R.).

June 8.—Inspection for opening for traffic of the Canadian Pacific railway, Bassano—Empress line, mile 0 to 118·3, and the Northwest Swift Current Line, mile 110·8 to 111·8.

June 8.—Inspection of the Canadian Pacific railway subway in the township of Albion, Cedar Mills, Ontario.

June 8.—Inspection of viaduct between St. Thomas junction and Talbot yard, on the line of the Père Marquette Railroad, St. Thomas, Ont.

June 9.—Inspection of the Canadian Pacific railway's new second track, between Herbert, mile 81·9 to Notman, mile 95.1, Swift Current subdivision, distance 13·2 miles.

June 10.—Inspection of the Grand Trunk railway *re* drainage at Hoards, Ont., in connection with complaint of D. McAdams.

June 11.—Inspection of Bessemer and Barry's bay railway bridge across Egan's creek at Bessemer junction, *re* complaint from P. A. Bradshaw of Detlor, Ont.

June 11.—Inspection of bridge over Cross creek at mileage 69 on the Canadian Pacific railway.

June 12.—Inspection of fencing on the line of the Canadian Pacific railway between Coldwater and Orillia, Ont.

June 12.—Inspection of H. Lafferby's diverted farm road across Grand Trunk railway borrow pit, Trenton, Ont.

June 12.—Inspection of W. L. Vandervoort's cattle pass, on the Canadian Northern Ontario and Campbellford, Lake Ontario and Western Railway Companies, Belleville, Ontario.

June 12.—Inspection of the Canadian Northern railway *re* extension of time for carrying traffic from Avonlea to Gravelburg.

June 12.—Inspection of the Canadian Northern railway, Kindersley subdivision, from Saskatoon to Rosetown, distance 72 miles, and from Rosetown to Kindersley, distance 54·1 miles, with a view of cancelling speed restrictions.

June 12.—Inspection of the Great Northern railway *re* condition of North road near New Westminster, B.C.

June 12.—Inspection of the Great Northern railway for traffic of Vancouver and Lulu Island railway, Third avenue to Granville street.

June 13.—Inspection of the Canadian Pacific railway on its Winnipeg Beach branch *re* suitable construction of culverts under its tracks on each of the following five public road allowances:—

Road between river lots 103 and 104.
" " " " 119 and 120.
" " Secs. 2 and 10-17-4-E.P.M.
" " " 15 and 22-17-4-E.P.M.
Greenwood ave., town of Selkirk.

June 13.—Inspection of the Canadian Pacific railway *re* construction of culvert on Greenwood avenue, Selkirk, Manitoba.

June 16.—Inspection of the Grand Trunk Pacific railway *re* placing a siding where their main line runs into Prince Albert, crossing the South Saskatchewan river at St. Louis.

June 16.—Inspection of the Kettle Valley railway (C.P.R.), *re* crossing public highway over its tracks, east of Penticton near mile 53.

June 16.—Inspection of the Kettle Valley railway (C.P.R.), *re* Main street crossing and Germyn street, also Calgary avenue at Penticton.

June 18.—Inspection of the Central Vermont railroad bridge over river road, Richelieu, Quebec.

June 18.—Inspection of the Canadian Pacific railway, Pheasant Hills branch, for a pipe crossing under its tracks in section 29-34-25, west 2nd meridian.

June 22.—Inspection of proposed subway at St. James, Winnipeg.

June 23.—Inspection for opening of traffic of the Canadian Pacific railway, Moosejaw subdivision, first track diversion east of McLean, from mile 66·5 to 68·5, distance of two miles.

June 23.—Inspection of the Medicine Hat Southern railway *re* leave to cross the Canadian Pacific railway by overhead crossing.

June 23.—Inspection of the Quebec Oriental railway, Gaspe Peninsula, *re* board's order.

June 23.—Inspection of the Quebec Oriental right of way *re* fencing through township of Mann.

June 24.—Inspection of the Atlantic, Quebec and Western railway's culvert *re* drainage, in connection with complaint of A. Lelièvre, Little river, east.

June 24.—Inspection for opening for traffic of the Canadian Pacific railway, Gleichen-Sheppard branch, Medicine Hat subdivision, mile 0 to 40·84.

June 24.—Inspection of the Grand Trunk Pacific railway *re* delay in completing their line to Moosejaw, and erection of station there.

June 24.—Inspection for opening of traffic of the Canadian Pacific railway, Port Moody branch, British Columbia division.

June 25.—Inspection of crossing of Main street, Orono, Ontario, by the Canadian Northern Ontario railway.

June 25.—Inspection of the dock siding of the Grand Trunk railway on Main street, Callender, Ont., *re* complaint of township of Himsworth.

June 25.—Inspection of crossing of public road between Con. 4 and 5, township of Portland, by the Canadian Northern Ontario railway.

June 25.—Inspection of crossing of Kingston road by the Campbellford, Lake Ontario and Western railway near Belleville, Ontario.

June 26. Inspection of the Canadian Northern railway *re* spur to serve the David Bowman Coal and Supply Company, Limited, in S.W. ¼ of section 18, range 4, west, north of Oak point, Man.

June 26.—Inspection of the Canadian Northern railway spur crossing Pembina street to serve the Winnipeg Sandstone Brick Company.

June 26.—Inspection for opening for traffic of the Canadian Pacific railway, Moosejaw, southwest branch, from mile 27·4 to 35, distance 7·6 miles.

June 27.—Inspection of the Canadian Pacific railway for alterations between Franklin and Donald streets in order to do away with the double crossing on Franklin street, just north of Arthur street, *re* complaint of city of Fort William, Ont.

June 27.—Inspection of the city of Fort William, Ont., *re* crossing Canadian Pacific railway, Canadian Northern railway and Grand Trunk Pacific railway by means of a subway on James street.

June 27.—Inspection of the Quebec Oriental railway bridges and culverts between Metapedia and New Carlisle, Quebec.

June 29.—Inspection of the Canadian Northern railway for removal of speed restrictions from Vegreville to Drumheller, Mile 0 to 173.

June 29.—Inspection of proposed cattle pass on farm of John Vaillant, lots 28-29-30, concession 9, township of Ross, county of Renfrew, on the Canadian Northern Ontario railway.

June 30.—Inspection of crossing of lane on farm of A. D. Palmer, lot 40, concession 9, township of Ross, by the Canadian Northern Ontario railway.

June 29.—Inspection of Canadian Northern Ontario railway from Newburgh to Ottawa for removal of speed restrictions.

June 29.—Inspection of the Canadian Northern railway Athabasca subdivision, for removal of speed restrictions.

July 1.—Inspection for opening of traffic of the Canadian Pacific railway, Ansley spur, Medicine Hat, distance 2 miles.

July 3.—Inspection of the Canadian Pacific railway, Red Deer subdivision, mile 2·5, for the city of Calgary for a spur.

July 6.—Inspection of the Grand Trunk Pacific railway *re* condition of roads on Empire avenue, in connection with complaint of the city property owners of Fort William, Ontario.

July 6.—Inspection of Jane street subway, Toronto, Ont., on the line of the Canadian Pacific railway *re* drainage.

July 7.—Inspection of the Canadian Pacific railway on Armstrong street, Parry Sound, *re* subway.

July 7.—Inspection for opening for traffic bridge at Syndicate avenue, Fort William, Ont., Manitoba subdivision.

July 8.—Inspection (joint) of the Canadian Northern railway's burnt bridge No. 2080, near Bears Pass, Atikokan subdivision.

July 8.—Inspection of the Canadian Northern railway roadbed, Winnipeg-Fort William line, M.P. 100.

July 9.—Inspection of the Grand Trunk railway plant at Queen street crossing, Ottawa, Ont.

July 10.—Inspection of the Grand Trunk Pacific railway *re* delay in completion of line and erection of station there, in connection with complaint of Moosejaw Board of Trade.

July 10.—Inspection for opening for traffic of the Canadian Pacific railway Kaslo-Slocan branch, British Columbia division.

July 10.—Inspection of the Canadian Pacific railway in connection with complaint of citizens of Vancouver and North Vancouver against change of its plans for North Vancouver ferry pedestrian subway.

July 10.—Inspection of drainage on farm of Duncan Reid, west half of lot 15, concession 1, township of Trafalgar, one mile west of Milton, on the line of the Canadian Pacific railway.

July 10.—Inspection of road crossing just west of the station at Goldstone, on the Grand Trunk railway.

July 10.—Inspection of proposed cattle pass on farm of Mr. Lasher, township of Camden, on the Campbellford, Lake Ontario and Western railway.

July 10.—Inspection for opening for traffic of the Canadian Pacific railway, Arrow Lake subdivision, bridge 15·3.

July 13.—Inspection of the Grand Trunk railway fences *re* complaint of F. McVian, London, Ont.

July 14.—Inspection for opening for traffic of the Canadian Pacific railway Broadview subdivision, mile 28·0 to Turtleford, mile 57.

July 15.—Inspection of crossing of road allowance between concessions 6 and 7, township of Tay, by the Grand Trunk railway.

July 21.—Inspection of the Canadian Northern railway, Battleford Northwesterly line, from Edam, mile 38, to Turtleford, mile 57.

July 22.—Inspection of the Grand Trunk Pacific railway at Prince George *re* location of station.

July 22.—Inspection *re* interchange between the Canadian Pacific railway and the Grand Trunk Pacific railway at Calgary.

July 22.—Inspection of the Canadian Northern railway at Le Pas, Manitoba, regarding railway service and station accommodation.

July 22.—Inspection for opening for traffic of the Canadian Pacific railway, Lacombe branch, from Kerrobert, mile 221·3, to Monitor, mile 149, distance 72·2 miles.

July 24.—Inspection of the Birds Hill Sand Company *re* removal of the spur track maintained by that company over part of the road allowance between sections 23 and 24, and 25 and 26, and requiring the restoration of the road allowance to the condition it was before the spur track was put in, or for the terms and conditions of the continued use to be fixed by the board, in connection with application of the rural municipality of Springfield, Manitoba.

July 26.—Inspection for opening for traffic of the Canadian Pacific railway, Alberta Central, mile 0 to 64·5.

July 30.—Inspection for opening for traffic of the Canadian Pacific Railway Company, McBride junction to Courtenay, a distance of 45 miles.

August 1.—Inspection for opening for traffic of the Canadian Pacific railway, Thompson subdivision, mile 1·1 to 1·45; mile 1·85 to 2·25; mile 4·1 to 4·2; and mile 6·3 to 7·7.

August 1.—Inspection for opening for traffic of the Canadian Pacific railway, Cascade subdivision, bridge 101·5.

August 1.—Inspection for opening for traffic of the Canadian Pacific railway's bridge 79·1, Cascade subdivision.

August 1.—Inspection for opening for traffic of the Canadian Pacific railway's bridge 75·6, Cascade subdivision.

August 1.—Inspection for opening for traffic of the Canadian Pacific railway's bridge 50·1, Cascade subdivision.

August 2.—Inspection for opening for traffic of the Canadian Pacific railway, Shuswap subdivision, miles 1·4 to 1·6; 1·8 to 2·3; 4·4 to 5·8; 7·7 to 10·4; 14·8 to 15·4; 18·6 to 20·2; 22·4 to 23·8; 113·25 to 114·2; 120·4 to 121·8; 123·4 to 123·7; 126·0 to 128·9.

August 3.—Inspection of the Canadian Pacific Railway Company's bridge at mile 78·4, Moosejaw subdivision.

August 3.—Inspection for opening for traffic of the Canadian Pacific Railway Company's bridge No. 17·7, Brandon subdivision.

August 3.—Inspection for opening for traffic of the Canadian Pacific Railway Company's bridge No. 14·3, Brandon subdivision.

August 3.—Inspection for opening for traffic of the Canadian Pacific Railway Company's bridge No. 9·6, Brandon subdivision.

August 3.—Inspection for opening for traffic of the Canadian Pacific Railway Company's bridge No. 32·4, Brandon subdivision.

August 3.—Inspection for opening for traffic of the Canadian Pacific Railway Company's bridge No. 5·9, Brandon subdivision.

August 3.—Inspection for opening for traffic of the Canadian Pacific Railway Company's bridge No. 11·9, Brandon subdivision.

August 4.—Inspection for opening for traffic of the Canadian Pacific railway, Weyburn-Westerly branch, from Shaunavon, mile 230·8 to Govanlock, mile 307·3, distance 76·5 miles.

August 5.—Inspection for opening for traffic of the Canadian Pacific Railway Company's bridge No. 87·0, Swift Current subdivision.

August 5.—Inspection for opening for traffic of the Canadian Pacific Railway Company's bridge No. 92·1, Swift Current subdivision.

August 5.—Inspection for opening for traffic of the Canadian Pacific Railway Company's bridge No. 109·4, Swift Current subdivision.

August 5.—Inspection for opening for traffic of the Canadian Pacific Railway Company's bridge No. 101·2, Swift Current subdivision.

August 5.—Inspection for opening for traffic of the Canadian Pacific Railway Company's bridge No. 73·4, Swift Current subdivision.

August 5.—Inspection of the Canadian Pacific railway, Suffield-Blackie branch, mile 26·3 to 57·2, *re* removal of speed restrictions.

August 5.—Inspection for opening for traffic of the Canadian Pacific railway, Suffield-Blackie branch, mile 57·2 to 84.

August 5.—Inspection of the Canadian Pacific railway, British Columbia division, *re* extension of Waldo branch, in connection with application of the Ross-Saskatoon Lumber Company.

August 7.—Inspection for opening for traffic of the Kootenay Central (C.P.R.), mile 41 to 59.

August 7.—Inspection of the Canadian Pacific railway, Laggan subdivision, *re* condition of timber lining in tunnels and change of time-tables of trains Nos. 2 and 3.

August 10.—Inspection and arbitration between the city of Calgary and the Canadian Pacific railway *re* disputed charges on 9th avenue subway, Calgary.

August 10.—Inspection in connection with complaint of the town of Kenora, Ont., per J. R. Britt, mayor, that the bridge over waterway in said town, controlled by the Rat Portage Lumber Company and the Canadian Pacific railway, is interfering with navigation.

August 13.—Inspection of the Canadian Pacific railway Asquith-Conquest branch, from a point on the Pheasant Hills branch near Asquith for 41·62 miles, to a point near Conquest on the Moosejaw northwesterly branch, and also *re* Canadian Pacific railway construction across highways, mile 0 to 41·62.

August 14.—Inspection of the Canadian Northern railway, in the municipality of Whitehead, *re* conditions of crossings.

August 19.—Inspection of the Grand Trunk Pacific railway, *re* widening of road at crossing north of Balcarres, Sask., in connection with complaint of the rural municipality of Abernethy, No. 186.

August 26.—Inspection for opening for traffic of the Canadian Northern railway, Wakopa subdivision, from Adopha, mile 51·84 to mile 79·70, distance 27·86 miles.

August 26.—Inspection of the Grand Trunk railway *re* proposed extension of Albert street across said company's lands in Victoriaville, Quebec.

August 29.—Inspection of the Dominion Lumber and Fuel Company, and T. D. Robinson and Sons, Limited, *re* spur.

August 29.—Inspection for opening for traffic of the Canadian Northern railway *re* new high level freight track over the Assiniboine river, and viaduct over Main street, and trestle connecting with the old line at Clark street, from the east end of the Assiniboine river to Clark street, distance 3,600 feet.

September 2.—Inspection for opening for traffic of the Canadian Pacific railway Moosejaw subdivision, single track diversion, mile 50 to 59·8, distance 9·8 miles, and new second track mile 59·8 to 67·6, distance 7·9 miles.

September 2.—Inspection in connection with complaint of the municipality of Qu'Appelle, against crossing as constructed on the east side of the town known as Pasqua street.

September 2.—Inspection of proposed farm crossing for Mrs. Copeland near Deep Brooke on the Dominion Atlantic railway.

September 3.—Inspection of North Mountain branch of the Dominion Atlantic railway for opening for traffic.

September 4.—Inspection of the Downie Combination Track Gauge and Recorder at Preque Isle, Maine.

September 4.—Inspection for opening for traffic of the Canadian Pacific railway Broadview subdivision, second track from mile 116·8 to Percival, mile 123·8, distance 7 miles.

September 8.—Inspection for opening for traffic of the Canadian Northern railway partly across Rainy Lake, Ont., from mile 226·4 to mile 227·2, distance 0·8 miles.

September 10.—Inspection of the Canadian Pacific railway to open its line for the carriage of traffic from mile 42 to end of track, Oakland branch, distance 12 miles.

September 10.—Inspection of the Canadian Northern railway *re* accident between M. P. 227 and 228, Kamsack subdivision, on November 26, 1913.

September 10.—Inspection of Henry Lasher's farm crossing at Roblindale on the line of the Campbellford, Lake Ontario and Western railway.

September 11.—Inspection of the Canadian Pacific railway *re* construction of spur track across Gordon avenue, Winnipeg, to and into premises of the Canadian Oil Company, Ltd.

September 14.—Inspection of the Canadian Pacific railway for opening for traffic of grade revision and line diversions, on the Soo branch.

September 15.—Inspection of the Algoma Central and Hudson Bay railway bridge at undercrossing of the Canadian Pacific Railway line, at Sault Ste. Marie, Ontario.

September 15.—Inspection of the Grand Trunk Pacific railway *re* to receive, deliver, and forward upon and from the existing spur now serving the property of the Tuxedo Park Company, Limited, the Canada Cement Company, Limited, and South Winnipeg.

September 15.—Inspection of the Canadian Pacific railway for interlocking plant at the crossing of the Bergen cut-off with the Lac du Bonnet subdivision (Winnipeg terminals).

September 15.—Inspection of the Canadian Pacific railway for interlocking plant where its Brandon branch at mile 5·6 at Woodman crosses the tracks of the Canadian Northern railway, Oak Point subdivision.

September 15.—Inspection of the Canadian Pacific railway for interlocking plant at the crossing of its Bergen cut-off with its Winnipeg Beach Branch (Winnipeg terminals).

September 15.—Inspection of the Canadian Pacific railway for interlocking plant at the crossing of its Bergen cut-off with its Arborg subdivision, mile 3·6 (Winnipeg terminals).

September 15.—Inspection of the Great Northern railway at McKelvie, *re* having farm crossing on John Shields' property of Brandon, Man., N.W. ¼, section 18-9-19, enlarged so as to be of sufficient width for the passing of his implements.

September 15.—Inspection for opening for traffic of the Kettle Valley railway (C.P.R.); west of Penticton, mile 17 to 40·9.

September 17.—Inspection of the Canadian Pacific railway, Shuswap subdivision, Malakwa district, to open crossing half a mile west of Malakwa, for Aug. Erickson.

September 17.—Inspection of the Canadian Pacific railway, Shuswap subdivision, Malakwa district, *re* farm crossing for B. Sederberg.

September 17.—Inspection of the Canadian Pacific railway, Shuswap subdivision, Malakwa district, to open crossing from Government road.

September 17.—Inspection of the Canadian Pacific railway, Shuswap subdivision, Malakwa district, to open farm crossing one mile east of Taft station, for J. Cullie.

September 17.—Inspection of the Canadian Pacific railway, Shuswap subdivision, Malakwa district, to open public road crossing one hundred yards east of Malakwa station.

September 17.—Inspection of the Canadian Pacific railway, Shuswap subdivision, Malakwa district, *re* culvert under right-of-way for B. Sederberg.

September 17.—Inspection of the Canadian Pacific railway, Shuswap subdivision, Malakwa district, to open crossing one and a half miles west of Malakwa for B. F. Somerville.

September 17.—Inspection of the Canadian Pacific railway, Shuswap subdivision, Malakwa district, *re* fencing.

September 17.—Inspection of the Canadian Pacific railway, Shuswap subdivision, Craigellachie district, *re* fencing in connection with complaints of Charles Fuller and Mike Luckoff.

September 17.—Inspection of the Canadian Pacific railway, Shuswap subdivision, Craigellachie district, *re* farm crossing for A. Drummond.

September 17.—Inspection of the Canadian Pacific railway, Shuswap subdivision, Craigellachie district, to open culverts to drain Willis lake under said railway.

September 17.—Inspection of the Canadian Pacific railway, Sicamous to Okanagan Landing at Enderby, *re* public road crossing.

September 17.—Inspection of the Algoma Central and Hudson Bay railway to open for carriage of traffic, from Aba to Hearst, Ontario.

September 17.—Inspection of the Canadian Pacific railway, Lake Superior division, for exemption from fencing right-of-way.

September 17.—Inspection *re* application of the Dominion Lumber and Fuel Company, Limited, and T. B. Robinson & Sons, Limited, *re* spur.

September 18.—Inspection of cattle pass on farm of A. G. Waite, 3 miles west of Streetsville Junction on the line of the Canadian Pacific railway.

September 20.—Inspection of the Canadian Pacific Railway Company's bridges at Sudbury subdivision.

September 25.—Inspection of the Canadian Pacific Railway Company's culvert 91·1 in Champlain, Que., in connection with complaint of municipality of Champlain.

September 25.—Inspection of the Canadian Northern Quebec railway *re* subway at Station avenue, Shawinigan Falls, Que.

September 25.—Inspection of the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway Company to build a crossing across the main line of the railway about half way between miles 117 and 118, west of the townsite of Zelma, and on the centre line running north and south through section 21-23-28, W. 2nd M., for the rural municipality of Morris.

September 25.—Inspection of the Canadian Pacific railway to open for traffic bridge No. 84·55, Bredenbury subdivision.

September 26.—Inspection of the Canadian Pacific railway, Red Deer subdivision, to open crossing in S.W.¼ of Section 7-31-1, west 5th meridian, for P. P. Dick.

September 25.—Inspection for opening for traffic of the Canadian Pacific railway Shuswap subdivision, mile 4·4 to 25 and 103·4 to 128·9, Thompson subdivision, mile 0·5 to 5·7.

September 28.—Inspection for opening for traffic of the Canadian Pacific Railway's bridge No. 45·8, McAuley subdivision (formerly Pheasant Hills, subdivision).

September 28.—Inspection of the Canadian Northern railway, Athabasca subdivision, *re* culverts, in connection with complaint of local improvement district No. 549 near Morinville.

September 28.—Inspection of the Edmonton, Dunvegan and British Columbia railway in connection with complaint *re* culvert of District No. 540 near Morinville between section 5 and 6-25-4 and section 32-55-24-4.

September 28.—Inspection of interlocking plant on the Edmonton, Dunvegan and British Columbia railway crossing the Canadian Northern railway near Morinville.

September 29.—Inspection of the Canadian Pacific railway, Virden McAuley branch, from Virden, mile 0 to 13·5, with a view of relieving the company of speed restriction.

September 30.—Inspection of under crossing at mileage 6·3 on the Tecswater subdivision of the Canadian Pacific railway in the township of Amaranth.

October 1.—Inspection *re* application of Robert Wallace and others, South Norfolk, for a subway between sections 24 and 25, township 11, range 12, W.P.M.

October 2.—Inspection of the Canadian Pacific railway to open for traffic bridge No. 7, Emerson subdivision.

October 2.—Inspection of interlocking plant of the Canadian Pacific railway and Canadian Northern Quebec railway L'Epiphanie, Quebec.

October 2.—Inspection of location of the Hawkins Brothers' spur on Wakefield street, Parry Sound, Ontario, on the line of the Canadian Northern Ontario railway.

October 3.—Inspection of the Central Vermont Railway Company's bridge over main road *re* complaint of the village of Richelieu, Que.

October 3.—Inspection for opening for traffic of the Canadian Pacific Railway Company's bridge No. 18·7, Emerson subdivision.

October 3.—Inspection for opening for traffic of the Canadian Pacific Railway Company's bridge No. 14·7, Emerson subdivision.

October 7.—Inspection of the Canadian Northern railway, west of Edmonton, for traffic interlocking plant, over Grand Trunk Pacific railway, section 31-53-10, west 5th meridian.

October 7.—Inspection of the Campbellford, Lake Ontario and Western railway *re* interlocking plant at crossing of Oshawa Electric railway, Oshawa, Ont.

October 8.—Inspection of the Canadian Northern Ontario railway between North Bay and Capreol for opening for traffic.

October 10.—Inspection for opening for traffic of the Canadian Northern railway from Avonlea to Gravelburg, distance 79 miles for a further extension of time.

October 13.—Inspection of subway at Neston, Ont., on the line of the Grand Trunk railway.

October 14.—Inspection of the Canadian Pacific railway, Laggan subdivision, *re* smoke in Field tunnels.

October 16.—Inspection for opening for traffic of the Kettle Valley railway (C.P.R.), mile 133·7 to 75·6, west of Midway.

October 16.—Inspection *re* private farm crossing on property of Mr. John Shields, Brandon, Manitoba.

October 16.—Inspection of the Canadian Pacific railway *re* Mill road diversion, Kemptville, Ont.

October 18.—Inspection for opening for traffic of the Canadian Pacific railway, boundary subdivision, bridge 94.

October 18.—Inspection for opening for traffic of the Canadian Pacific Railway Company's bridge 119·2, boundary subdivision.

October 19.—Inspection for opening for traffic of the Canadian Pacific Railway Company's bridge 98·1, McLeod subdivision.

October 19.—Inspection of the Canadian Pacific railway, Mountain subdivision, *re* farm crossing for Mrs. C. M. Fraser, Revelstoke, B.C.

October 19.—Inspection of the Canadian Pacific railway and the Great Northern railway *re* request of Public Service Commission of the State of Montana with respect to train service between Great Falls and Calgary by way of Sweetgrass.

October 20.—Inspection of the Canadian Northern Ontario railway between Chaffey's Lock and Perth road pit, a distance of 11·4 miles with a view to removal of speed restrictions.

October 21.—Inspection of road crossing between lots 10 and 11, concession 3, township of North Orillia, on the line of the Grand Trunk railway west of Uhtoff, Ont.

October 22.—Inspection of site of proposed extension of Fisher road between lots 8 and 9, township of Niagara, across the track of the Michigan Central railroad.

October 22.—Inspection of public road crossing between lots 22 and 23, concession 1, township of Grimsby, on the line of the Canadian Northern Ontario railway.

October 22.—Inspection of highway crossings on the Campbellford, Lake Ontario and Western railway, in the township of Hope and Clark, Ontario.

October 28.—Inspection of the Grand Trunk and Canadian Pacific Railway Companies' subways *re* drainage complaint from municipality St. Anne de Bellevue, Que.

October 31.—Inspection for opening for traffic of the Canadian Pacific railway, Winnipeg Beach branch, extension line from Gimli to Riverton, distance 26 miles.

November 2.—Inspection *re* crossing at Syndicate avenue, Fort William, Ont.

November 3.—Inspection of the Glengarry and Stormont railway *re* McGillis cattle pass, Dalhousie Mills, Ont.

November 4.—Inspection *re* the Grand Trunk Pacific stock yards spur crossing the east main line of the Canadian Northern railway at Dawson road.

November 5.—Inspection of the Georgian Bay and Seaboard railway *re* highway crossings in the township of Eldon.

November 6.—Inspection *re* compelling the Canadian Pacific railway to grade a road into the town of Alida, or collect tolls from the company for this townsite by the municipality of Reciprocity No. 32, per J. A. Leamy, New Home, Sask.

November 9.—Inspection for opening for traffic of the Canadian Pacific railway, Shuswap subdivision, bridge 24·2.

November 9.—Inspection for opening for traffic of the Canadian Pacific Railway Company's bridge 109·36, Mountain subdivision.

November 9.—Inspection for opening for traffic of the Canadian Pacific Railway Company's bridge 117·4, Shuswap subdivision.

November 9.—Inspection of the Canadian Pacific railway *re* application to open for traffic bridge No. 66·6, Souris subdivision.

November 9.—Inspection *re* complaint of the rural municipality of Walpole, for crossings on the Maryfield-Lethbridge branch of the Canadian Northern railway.

November 9.—Inspection of the Grand Trunk Pacific *re* application for an order authorizing permanent exemption from erecting and maintaining fences on its line west of Winnipeg.

November 9.—Inspection *re* the unsatisfactory condition of crossings, and that cattle-guards in the rural municipality of Morton are insufficient protection to live stock, *re* application of the Board of Trade, Brandon, Man.

November 10.—Inspection for opening for traffic of the Canadian Pacific railway, Cascade subdivision, bridge 68·3.

November 11.—Inspection of the Canadian Pacific railway *re* crossing to be constructed at a point west of Balcarres for the municipality of Abernethy, No. 186.

November 11.—Inspection of the Canadian Pacific railway *re* interlocking plant at crossing with the Quebec, Montreal and Southern railway, Iberville Junction, Que.

November 12.—Inspection of the Canadian Pacific railway proposed road diversion, Highlands, Que., *re* complaint of town of Lasalle.

November 12.—Inspection of drainage system through the Canadian Pacific railway property at Theodore.

November 12.—Inspection of road diversion on the Canadian Northern Ontario railway near Pembroke, Ont.

November 16.—Inspection of the Canadian Northern railway, Calgary subdivision, *re* removal of speed restrictions.

November 16.—Inspection for opening for traffic of the Canadian Northern railway, Camrose cutoff to Strathcona.

November 17.—Inspection of the Campbellford, Lake Ontario and Western railway at Bowmanville, Ont., *re* interlocking plant at crossing with Toronto Eastern railway.

November 18.—Inspection of the Campbellford, Lake Ontario and Western railway at Parham, Ont., *re* interlocking plant at crossing with the Kingston and Pembroke railway.

November 18.—Inspection of street crossings on the Lachine, Jacques Cartier and Maisonneuve railway, Montreal, Que.

November 19.—Inspection for opening for traffic of the Canadian Pacific railway, Swift Current N. W. branch, from Westerham, mile 94, to mile 110·8, distance 16 miles.

November 19.—Inspection for opening for traffic of the Canadian Pacific railway, Bassano-Empress line, from mile 0 to mile 118·3, with a view of removing speed limitation of 20 miles an hour between mile 0 to 75, and 18 miles an hour between mile 118·8 and 110·8.

November 20.—Inspection of the Canadian Pacific railway, McLeod subdivision, *re* half interlocker on 11th street east, Calgary city street railway crossing.

November 20.—Inspection of the Canadian Pacific railway *re* Thomas Culhane's cattle pass, Opeongo, Ont.

November 21.—Inspection *re* application of the city of Regina to carry city street railway across the tracks of the Grand Trunk Pacific on Dewdney street.

November 23.—Inspection of the Canadian Pacific Railway Company's bridge No. 1·9, Prescott subdivision.

November 25.—Inspection of the Blainville street crossing of the Canadian Pacific railway Ste. Therèse, Que.

November 25.—Inspection for opening for traffic of the Canadian Pacific railway line from Assiniboia, mile 112 to Woodrow, mile 145·7 with a view of relieving the company of a speed limit of 18 miles an hour, and from Woodrow, mile 145·7 to Shaunavon, of a speed limit of 25 miles an hour.

November 26.—Inspection for opening for traffic of the Canadian Pacific railway, eastern division.

November 26.—Inspection of the Canadian Pacific railway siding at Forward, Sask.

November 26.—Inspection for opening for traffic of the Canadian Pacific railway, Weyburn west branch, from Shaunavon, mile 230·8 to Govelock, mile 307·3, a distance of 75 miles, with a view of removing speed limit.

November 27.—Inspection of Toronto Eastern railway from Whitby to Bowmanville for opening for traffic.

December 2.—Inspection of farm crossing for Mr. Colwell on the line of the Campbellford, Lake Ontario and Western railway near Newcastle, Ont.

December 3.—Inspection of the Canadian Pacific railway on public road along Oxford Mountain Railway, Windsor Mills, *re* complaint of municipality of Brompton.

December 3.—Inspection of the Canadian Pacific railway, Bird's Hills sub-division, between Bird's Hill and Grand Marais, distance 49·1 miles.

December 4.—Inspection for opening for traffic of the Canadian Northern railway, Grosse Isle subdivision, from Inwood to Hodgson, distance 50 miles.

December 7.—Inspection of the Canadian Northern railway, Manitoba railway, from Deerfield Junction to Steep Rock, distance 12½ miles.

December 9.—Inspection for opening for traffic of the Canadian Pacific railway, Moosejaw S.W. branch, from mile 0 to 50, part of this inspection, namely, to mile 35, with a view of removing speed limit.

December 10.—Inspection of the Canadian Northern Quebec Railway Company's tracks, on Montfort branch.

December 11.—Inspection for opening for traffic of the Kootenay Central railway (C.P.R.), mile 23 to 82·5.

December 15.—Inspection of Glengarry and Stormont railway for opening for traffic.

December 16.—Inspection of the Moore street bridge, Toronto, Ont.

December 17.—Inspection of the Erie and Ontario railway for opening for traffic from Smithville to Dunnville, Ont.

December 18.—Inspection of diversion of Grand Trunk railway near Thorold, Ont.

December 19.—Inspection of the Boston and Maine railroad crossing at Ives street, Rock Island, Que.

December 21.—Inspection *re* accident on the Grand Trunk Pacific railway, at Transcona shops, by which A. A. Simonson was injured.

December 21.—Inspection *re* accident on the Grand Trunk railway at Kenora, Ont., November 17, 1913.

December 24.—Inspection of the Hamilton street overhead foot bridge, *re* application of city of Regina.

December 30.—Inspection of the Grand Trunk railway street crossings, Casselman, Ont.

December 30.—Inspection for opening for traffic of the Canadian Pacific railway, Thompson subdivision, mile 0 to 0·5.

December 30.—Inspection *re* complaint of the rural municipality of Carmichael No. 109, road crossing over the Canadian Pacific railway, Swift Current subdivision, between sections 32 and 33-12-20, west third division.

January 4.—Inspection of the Canadian Northern railway *re* spur track across Victoria avenue, and down the lane in block 41, Brandon, Man., in connection with complaint of Messrs. Cook and Wayling.

January 4.—Inspection of bridges on the Grand Trunk railway at Windsor, Ont.

January 5.—Inspection of Mimico industrial spur, Mimico, Ont.

January 7.—Inspection *re* application of the municipality of West Kildonan for crossing over the tracks of the Selkirk branch of the Canadian Pacific railway, Inniskillen avenue.

January 11.—Inspection *re* dangerous conditions of crossings on the Canadian Northern railway in connection with complaint of the municipality of Strathclaire.

January 12.—Inspection of the Quebec and Lake St. John railway from Quebec to Chicoutimi.

January 18.—Inspection *re* complaint of the municipality of Whitehead, against crossings on the Canadian Northern railway.

January 18.—Inspection of the Grand Trunk Railway bridge over Welland canal, near St. Catharines, Ont.

January 19.—Inspection of highway crossing on Grand Trunk railway, near Huntsville, Ont.

January 19.—Inspection of Canadian Pacific Railway bridges, Ontario division.

January 19.—Inspection *re* relieving the Grand Trunk Pacific B. L. Railway Company from erecting and maintaining fences, gates and cattle-guards on its Melville-Canora branch, mile 0 to 54·72.

January 21.—Inspection *re* keeping open two crossings on the Grand Trunk Pacific boundary line on the north and east sides of section 8, township 10, range 13, west 2nd meridian, mile 63·1.

January 21.—Inspection *re* relieving the Grand Trunk Pacific Branch Lines Company from erecting and maintaining fences, gates and cattle-guards on its Regina boundary branch, mile 0 to 155.

January 21.—Inspection of street crossings on the Lachine, Jacques Cartier and Maisonneuve railway, Montreal, Que.

January 21.—Inspection of the Canadian Pacific Railway highway crossings, in the township of W. Missouri.

January 21.—Inspection of the Grand Trunk Railway bridges, Buffalo and Goderich division.

January 22.—Inspection *re* relieving the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway Branch Lines Company from erecting and maintaining fences, gates and cattle-guards on its Moosejaw N.W. branch mile 0 to 66.

January 22.—Inspection *re* relieving the Grand Trunk Pacific Branch Lines Company from erecting and maintaining fences, gates and cattle-guards on its Moosejaw N.W. branch from mile 0 to 66.

January 22.—Inspection *re* relieving the Grand Trunk Pacific Branch Lines Company from erecting and maintaining fences, gates and cattle-guards on its Melville-Regina branch, mile 0 to 97·0.

January 25.—Inspection of the Grand Trunk Pacific *re* highway crossings on its Regina-Melville branch.

January 25.—Inspecton of the Lake Erie and Northern Railway bridge over the Grand river at Brantford, Ont.

January 25.—Inspection of location of Hamilton Radial railway on Sherman inlet, Hamilton, Ont.

January 28.—Inspection *re* crossings across the Canadian Pacific Railway and the Canadian Northern Quebec Railway Companies' right of way, municipality of d'Argenteuil.

January 28.—Inspection *re* public crossing across the Quebec, Montreal and Southern Railway tracks at St. James street, town of St. Lambert.

January 29.—Inspection of the Canadian Northern Quebec Railway sidings across Stadacona and Marlboro streets in Hochelaga ward, Montreal, Que.

January 29.—Inspection for opening for traffic of the Canadian Pacific railway, Edmonton subdivision, bridge 9·3.

January 29.—Inspection for opening for traffic of the Edmonton, Dunvegan and British Columbia railway, mile 0 to 261·7.

February 1.—Inspection of bridge at Carlaw avenue, Toronto, Ont.

February 1.—Inspection of interlocking plant at Dunnville, Ont.

February 2.—Inspection of the Canadian Pacific railway, Bassano-Empress line, *re* Mr. Nikolai's farm crossing, section 27-20-10, west 4th meridian.

February 3.—Inspection of the Canadian Pacific Railway bridge No. 3·6, Prescott subdivision.

February 4.—Inspection of the Canadian Pacific Railway bridges, Brockville subdivision.

February 4.—Inspection *re* application of R. G. Shackleford, Keyes, Man., for a private crossing with gates on the northwest quarter-section 33-14-13, Canadian Pacific railway.

February 5.—Inspection of the Grand Trunk Pacific railway, west of Edmonton, *re* complaint of R. P. Cull, of Fallis, Alta., *re* right of way and road crossing.

February 5.—Inspection of the Grand Trunk Pacific, west of Edmonton, *re* road crossing report.

February 9.—Inspection of the Canadian Pacific Railway Company's bridges on the Bobcaygeon subdivision.

February 10.—Inspection of the Grand Trunk Railway Company's bridges, Hamilton-Allandale, 13th district.

February 11.—Inspection of the Canadian Pacific Railway Company's bridges, Port Burwell subdivision.

February 11—Inspection of the Grand Trunk Pacific for approval of highway crossing in the northwest quarter-section 11-11-3, west principal meridian.

February 12.—Inspection of the Canadian Pacific railway, Cascade subdivision, *re* fencing for H. Graham, Indian agent at Lytton.

February 12.—Inspection of the Canadian Pacific Railway Company's bridges, Hamilton-Goderich subdivision.

February 14.—Inspection of interlocking plant at Attercliffe, Ont.

February 15.—Inspection *re* protection of street crossings in the city of Port Arthur.

February 16.—Inspection of the Canadian Pacific railway *re* operation of its trains over the following bridges, namely: Main street north, Parkside street, Scotia street, East Kildonan road; all in the municipality of Kildonan.

February 16—Inspection of the Canadian Pacific railway *re* operation of its trains over bridge No. 8·4, Winnipeg Beach branch.

February 16.—Inspection of the Canadian Pacific Railway Company's tracks, St. Thomas branch.

February 18.—Inspection of the Canadian Pacific Railway Company's bridge on St. Patrick street, town of Lasalle, Que.

February 19.—Inspection of the Canadian Pacific Railway Company's bridge 42·4, near Acton Vale, Quebec, Drummondville subdivision.

February 22.—Inspection for opening for traffic of the Canadian Pacific railway, Lethbridge subdivision, bridge at 13th street, Lethbridge.

February 23.—Inspection of cattle pass on farm of Mr. Vandervoort, Belleville, Ont., on the line of the Campbellford, Lake Ontario and Western railway.

February 23.—Inspection of road crossings through station yards *re* complaint of the board of trade of Dunner, Sask.

February 24.—Inspection of overhead bridges on the London and Port Stanley railway.

February 26.—Inspection of the Canadian Pacific Railway Company's bridge No. 52·3 near Allandale, Ont., Havelock subdivision.

March 1.—Inspection *re* application of the corporation of Fort William, Ont., for authority to operate highway and street railway traffic over the Canadian Pacific Railway bridge and approaches across Kaministiquia river.

March 4.—Inspection of the Canadian Pacific Railway crossing gates at St. Maurice, St. Thomas and Bonaventure streets, Three Rivers, Quebec.

March 5.—Inspection of the public road crossing over the Grand Trunk Pacific railway at Vanderhoof, B.C.

March 6.—Inspection for opening for traffic of the Canadian Pacific Railway bridge No. 0·41, Fort William terminals. (3rd track over McVicar street.)

March 6.—Inspection of the Canadian Northern railway *re* not fencing their right of way through the property of Mr. Charles J. Miller, Canora, Sask.

March 9.—Inspection *re* accident on the line of the Canadian Northern Railway M. P. 320, Humboldt subdivision.

March 9.—Inspection *re* accident on the line of the Canadian Northern railway between mile post 227 and 228, on November 26, 1913, Kamsack subdivision.

March 12.—Inspection of crossing of George street by the Campbellford, Lake Ontario and Western railway in town of Cobourg, Ontario.

March 12.—Inspection of Division Street subway in the town of Cobourg, Ont., on the Grand Trunk railway.

March 15.—Inspection of site of proposed extension of Wyandotte street across the tracks of the Michigan Central railway at Windsor, Ontario.

March 15.—Inspection of the Canadian Pacific railway *re* replacement at bridge No. 18·1, Moosejaw subdivision.

March 15.—Inspection of private crossing, one mile west of Indian Head, *re* application of Mr. Gardiner.

March 15.—Inspection of the Canadian Pacific railway at Burwash, Ont., *re* crossing asked for by the Ontario Government.

March 16.—Inspection of the Canadian Pacific railway at Livingston, Ont., *re* application of township of Thessalon, for public crossing.

March 16.—Inspection of the Canadian Pacific railway, Lethbridge subdivision, bridge at 13th street, Lethbridge, Alta., *re* if constructed satisfactory to the city of Lethbridge and if the division of cost was satisfactory.

March 16.—Inspection of farm crossing on property of Mr. Good at Richmond, Ont., on the line of the Canadian Northern Ontario railway.

March 18.—Inspection of highway crossing over the Grand Trunk railway at James street, Brantford, Ont.

March 18.—Inspection of the Algoma Central and Hudson Bay railway at Island Lake, Ont., *re* complaint of G. Goodrow about siding and fencing.

March 18.—Inspection *re* condition of tracks on the Athabaska subdivision; Stony-Plain subdivision; Edmonton, Yukon and Pacific subdivision; Edmonton subdivision; Vermilion subdivision; Sturgeon River subdivision; Cut Knife subdivision, being portions of line of the Canadian Northern railway in Alberta and Saskatchewan.

March 19.—Inspection of the Canadian Pacific Railway Company's bridge over Magnetawan river, Byng Inlet, Ontario.

March 19.—Inspection of interlocking plant at crossing of the Grand Trunk railway by the Glengarry & Stormont railway at Cornwall, Ontario.

March 20.—Inspection *re* application of the rural municipality of Gull Lake, No. 139, for an order directing that said crossing be made at the S.E. section 613·2, west 3rd meridian.

March 20.—Inspection of the Grand Trunk Railway Company's bridges, Northern division.

March 22.—Inspection for opening for traffic of the Canadian Northern railway, St. Albert West to mile 35, junction of Peace River line.

March 23.—Inspection of site of proposed highway crossing on the Waltham branch of the Canadian Pacific railway abont a mile north of McKee station.

March 25.—Inspection of interlocking plant at Trenton, Ont.

March 26.—Inspection of subway at Bridgebury, Ontario.

March 26.—Inspection of the Grand Trunk and Canadian Pacific Railway Companies' drainage of subways, St. Annes, Que.

March 27.—Inspection of the track conditions of the Canadian Pacific railway, St. Augustine, Que.

March 28.—Inspection of crossing of the Port Burwell road by the single track of the Canadian Pacific railway at mile 32·7, near Port Burwell, Ont.

March 29.—Inspection of Dominion Atlantic railway from Somerset to Weston for opening for traffic.

March 30.—Inspection of the Canadian Pacific Railway bridges at Fredericton, N.B.

March 30.—Inspection of interlocking plant where the Winnipeg Northern railway (C.N.R.) crosses the Canadian Pacific railway, in lot 101, Parish of St. Paul.

March 31.—Inspection for an underground crossing or cattle pass on the property of Walter G. Budd, Rapid City, Man., on the NE. ¼ of section 23-13-20, west principal meridian, on the Canadian Pacific railway.

March 31.—Inspection for opening for traffic of the Edmonton, Dunvegan and British Columbia railway, mile 261·7 to 287.

APPENDIX "F."

REPORT OF THE OPERATING DEPARTMENT FOR THE YEAR ENDING MARCH 31, 1915.

June 29, 1915.

Mr. A. D. Cartwright,
Secretary,
B.R.C. Building.

Dear Sir.—I have the honour to submit herewith, for the tenth report of the board, the report of the operating department for the year ending March 31, 1915.

It is impracticable, of course, to make reference, in detail, to the work of the department for the year. But the various subject matters following together with the several statements appended hereto, will, no doubt, convey to the reader some idea as to the nature and extent of the work.

During the year accidents to the number of 1,468, covering 337 persons killed and 1,363 persons injured, were reported by the various railway companies under the board's jurisdiction. The attention of the reader is herewith directed to statement No. 1.

Statement No. 2 is a comparative statement of the killed and injured, classified, as between the year ending March 31, 1915, and the preceding year. This statement should, indeed, be very gratifying inasmuch as it shows a very substantial decrease under every heading, with a grand total decrease of 257 persons in the number of killed and 536 persons in the number of injured. In other words, there is a decrease of 43 per cent in the killed and 28 per cent in the injured over the preceding year.

A persnal of statement No. 3 will show that, out of the 337 persons killed, there were trespassers to the number of 170, which figure represents, approximately, 50 per cent of the grand total killed for the year. It will be observed that there were 47 persons killed as a result of highway crossing accidents, or approximately 14 per cent of the grand total killed. The number of person killed on account of being run down by a moving engine or car is shown as 33, or approximately 10 per cent of the grand total killed. The headings dealing with collisions, head-on and rear-end, and derailments, account for 21 persons killed, or 6·23 per cent of the grand total killed. It will be observed that there were no passengers killed as a result of derailments and collisions. It is pointed out that there were three persons killed while jumping off trains in motion and two persons killed in attempt to board train in motion. On referring to the injured column, it will be observed that there were 126 injured while trespassing, or 9·24 per cent of the grand total injured. There were 90 persons injured as a result of highway crossing accidents, or 6·60 per cent of the grand total injured. The headings referring to collisions and derailments show that 259 persons were injured, or 19 per cent of the grand total injured. It is pointed out that, out of the 259 injured as above in derailments and collisions, 149 were passengers, or approximately 57 per cent. There were 45 persons injured jumping off trains in motion and 29 persons injured whilst attempting to board trains in motion, or 3·30 per cent and 2·13 per cent respectively of the grand total injured.

Statement No. 5 shows the increases and decreases as between the various accidents for the years ending March 31, 1914 and 1915. Attention is particularly directed to the decrease of 32 persons killed and 175 persons injured as a result of derailment. There is an increase of 17 persons injured and a decrease of 5 killed a sa result of

head-on collision. Under the heading "Rear-end collision" it will be observed that there is a decrease of 7 persons killed and 26 persons injured. At highway crossings protected by gates there is a decrease of 4 killed and 3 persons injured. At highway crossings protected by bell there is an increase of 1 person killed and 1 injured. At highway crossings protected by a watchman there is a decrease of 4 persons killed and 7 injured. At unprotected highway crossings there is a decrease of 7 killed and 16 injured. As regards trespassers there is a decrease of 68 persons killed and 38 persons injured. Under the heading "Run down by moving engine or car" there is a decrease of 23 persons killed and 23 injured. Under the heading "Adjusting couplers, etc.," there is a decrease of 4 persons killed and 22 persons injured. The heading "Jumping off train in motion" shows a decrease of 4 killed and 10 injured and under the heading "Attempt to board train in motion" there is a decrease of 6 persons killed and 18 persons injured. The last heading on this statement "Locomotive dropped crown sheet of firebox" shows a decrease of 2 persons killed and 1 person injured.

The figures set forth in statement No. 11 shows that during the year investigations into accidents numbered 466, covering 143 persons killed and 572 persons injured. This as against 714 investigations covering 238 persons killed and 938 persons injured for the preceding year. It will be observed that, deducting the number of trespassers killed, 170, all accidents attended by fatal results, with the exception of 24, were inquired into.

The matter of protection at public highway crossings is made reference to in statement Nos. 13 and 14. It will be observed that protection in one form or another, has been ordered at 251 highway crossings during the past three years; 65 highway crossings having been protected during the past year. The majority of these crossings have received financial assistance from the Railway Grade Crossing fund.

It will be observed by a glance at statement No. 16 that, since the inception of the board, or for the past eleven years, accidents covering 5,233 persons killed and 13,126 persons injured have been reported by the various railways under the board's jurisdiction.

Statement No. 17 sets out the number of persons killed and injured in the more prominent accidents during the past five years.

A check of statement No. 18 shows that the matter of percentage of freight cars controlled by air brakes in trains is receiving attention. The order of the board sets the minimum at 85 per cent, while the average works out to 91·75 per cent.

Statements Nos. 19, 20 and 21 deal with the matter of safety appliance inspection on freight cars. It will be observed that there were 105,486 cars inspected, out of which 6,578 cars were defective, or 6·24 per cent. There were 7,009 defects reported against the 6,578 defective cars. It is pointed out that 541 terminal inspections were made to obtain the above results.

Application for approval of station locations to the number of 116 were examined and approved as set out in statement No. 22.

A perusal of statement No. 23 shows that during the year complaints and applications to the number of 437 were inquired into and reported upon.

A large number of informal matters were reported by the inspectors, all of which were taken up and disposed of by direct correspondence with the various railway officials.

A systematic inspection of station buildings and passenger cars as regards accommodation, cleanliness, etc., has been carried on throughout the year with good results.

During the year locomotives to the number of 7,477 were inspected, out of which 1,141 reported as defective, or 15·26 per cent.

Under Order No. 14115, dated April 14, 1911, railway companies are required to file monthly and annual inspection reports for each and every locomotive boiler and its appurtenances. A check of these reports shows that the requirements are generally

being lived up to. It might be pointed out that there were only 3 persons injured during the year as a result of locomotives dropping crown sheets of fireboxes. In no case, however, did our inquiry reveal defective material or workmanship.

To accomplish the work briefly outlined above has required the travelling of 308,096 miles during the year.

The question of hand-rails and foot rests on tenders and cabs of locomotives is a matter that is now before the department for consideration. It has been suggested that these conveniences would render material assistance in reducing accidents. The matter should be finally disposed of very shortly.

Mention is herewith made of the interest railway companies are showing in the matter of providing steel passenger equipment. Our inquiry in this direction shows that, in so far as the several large railway companies are concerned, only cars of steel construction are now being built for passenger service.

The matter of the application for an order defining the maximum length of trains is a situation that is under investigation by the department. It has been suggested that there is considerable danger and hardship created by having to handle trains consisting of from 100 to 125 cars. The investigation is progressing and a report should be forthcoming at an early date.

Another important matter that is now before the department for inquiry and report is the question of protection afforded trains by sectionmen when the main track is disrupted on account of repairs. It is argued that sectionmen should be required to flag trains under Rule No. 99 of the Uniform Code of Operating Rules. The situation, it is expected, will be finally disposed of in the near future.

The question of standardizing the location of emergency air brake valve in passenger cars, or attaching a cord to the same to be accessible from any part of a car, is another matter that is now under consideration by the department. It has been suggested that, by adoption of the cord arrangement and the posting of instructions to passengers as to the use thereof, quite frequently a train can be brought to a stop by the application of the emergency valve by a passenger before serious results obtained. A report in this matter should be submitted without any great delay.

Complaint has been lodged that an element of danger is created by the fact of giving train and enginemen surprise tests on train signals. This matter is now being fully inquired into.

Attention is directed to Circular No. 139, January 13, 1915, requiring railway companies to post notices ten days prior to any change in passenger train service.

Circular No. 140, January 2, 1915, sets out certain instructions pertaining to the inspection of locomotive boilers and their appurtenances.

An interpretation of section 4 of Order No. 12225 is set out in Circular No. 137, October 7, 1914. This has reference to the matter of providing a conductor for light engines.

The matter of equipping cabooses with marker sockets in the lower position is covered by General Order No. 127, July 6, 1914.

General Order No. 128, 20th July, 1914, grants an extension of time in regard to complying with certain regulations pertaining to safety appliances as covered by General Order No. 102.

Reference is made to General Order No. 131, July 6, 1914, setting out that locomotives with certain defects must not be permitted in service.

All of which is respectfully submitted.

(Signed) GEO. SPENCER,
Chief Operating Officer.

SESSIONAL PAPER No. 20c

THE BOARD OF RAILWAY COMMISSIONERS FOR CANADA.

No. 1.—STATEMENT showing the Number of Persons Killed and Injured on various Railways in Canada under the jurisdiction of the Board for the Year ending March 31, 1915.

Name of Railway.	Passengers.		Employees.		Other Persons.		Total.	
	K.	I.	K.	I.	K.	I.	K.	I.
Grand Trunk	1	150	30	266	99	98	129	514
Canadian Pacific	6	26	41	96	88	76	135	198
Canadian Northern	1	19	9	235	16	21	26	275
Grand Trunk Pacific	.....	7	3	62	2	15	5	84
Toronto, Hamilton and Buffalo	.....	.....	1	55	3	4	4	59
Canadian Northern Quebec	.....	2	2	22	5	2	7	26
Pere Marquette	.....	4	1	45	1	6	2	55
Michigan Central	.....	2	1	28	4	6	5	36
Quebec, Montreal and Southern	.....	.....	.....	2	.....	.....	.....	2
Dominion Atlantic	.....	.....	.....	2	1	.....	1	2
Central Vermont	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	2	.....	2
Atlantic, Quebec and Western	.....	1	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	1
Halifax and South Western	.....	.....	.....	1	.....	1	.....	2
Central Ontario	.....	.....	2	.....	.....	.....	2	.....
Chatham, Wallaceburg and Lake Erie	.....	.....	.....	1	.....	.....	.....	1
Esquimalt and Nanaimo	.....	.....	1	2	1	1	2	3
Algoma Eastern	.....	.....	.....	1	.....	.....	.....	1
Quebec and Lake St. John	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	1	.....	1
Winnipeg Joint Terminals	.....	.....	.....	2	.....	.....	.....	2
Windsor, Essex and Lake Shore	.....	14	1	2	.....	4	1	20
Erie and Ontario	.....	.....	.....	1	.....	.....	.....	1
Algoma Central and Hudson Bay	.....	.....	.....	3	1	.....	1	3
Morrissey, Fernie and Michel	.....	.....	.....	1	.....	.....	.....	1
Ottawa and New York	.....	.....	2	4	.....	2	2	6
Brantford and Hamilton Electric	.....	.....	.....	.....	1	2	1	2
Wabash	.....	.....	4	8	.....	1	4	9
Canadian Northern Ontario	.....	8	.....	6	5	5	5	19
St. Lawrence Adirondack	.....	3	1	7	1	3	2	13
Niagara, St. Catharines and Toronto	.....	3	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	3
Quebec Oriental	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	1	.....	1
Vancouver, Victoria and Eastern	.....	.....	.....	18	.....	.....	.....	18
Boston and Maine	.....	.....	.....	3	3	.....	3	3
	8	239	99	873	230	251	337	1,363

THE BOARD OF RAILWAY COMMISSIONERS FOR CANADA.

No. 2.—A COMPARATIVE STATEMENT of Killed and Injured between Year ending March 31, 1914, and Year ending March 31, 1915.

	Passengers.		Employees.		Others.		Total.	
	K.	I.	K.	I.	K.	I.	K.	I.
Year ending March 31, 1914	31	339	249	1,250	314	310	594	1,899
Year ending March 31, 1915	8	239	99	873	230	251	337	1,363
Increase over 1914	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....
Decrease over 1914	23	100	150	377	84	59	257	536

THE BOARD OF RAILWAY COMMISSIONERS FOR CANADA.

No. 3.—STATEMENT showing separately the Number of Passengers, Employees and others Killed and Injured, and the nature of the Accidents for Year ending March 31, 1915.

Character of Accidents.	Passengers.		Employees.		Others.		Total.	
	K.	I.	K.	I.	K.	I.	K.	I.
Derailment		43	7	39			7	82
Collision head on		33	2	13			2	46
Collision rear end		33	5	15	2	1	7	49
Collision in yard		33	3	21			3	54
Collision with cars standing foul of main track				2				2
Collision with cars account open switch		1		3				4
Collision at level crossing		6		12	2	4	2	22
Highway crossing protected by gates				1	6	9	6	10
Highway crossing protected by bell					2	7	2	7
Highway crossing protected by watchman					2	5	2	5
Highway crossing unprotected				1	37	67	37	68
Private crossing					3	2	3	2
Trespassing			1	5	169	121	170	126
Working on or under engine			1	55	1		2	55
Unclassified	2	31	6	163	4	14	12	208
Adjusting couplers, coupling and uncoupling			7	38			7	38
Working on track or bridge			3	86			3	86
Falling off hand car, motor or velocipede			3	26	1		4	26
Hand car, motor, velocipede struck by train			5	9			5	9
Crawling under cars						1		1
Crawling through cars over couplers			1	1			1	1
Caught while passing through cars between couplers				4	1		1	4
Cars standing foul				7				7
Struck by switch stand, water spout, etc			1	8			1	8
Crushed between cars, buildings, platforms, etc				9				9
Explosion of locomotive boiler								
Falling off passenger train	2	8	1	2		1	3	11
Falling off tender while handling coal				6				6
Falling off tender while taking water				7				7
Working in shop			4	88			4	96
Riding on pilot of engine			2	6			2	6
Overhead bridge				1				1
Repairing cars on repair track when moved by engine				1				1
Falling off top of car while walking over train			4	22			4	22
Falling between cars going over top			2	3			2	3
Train parting and colliding			1	2		1	1	3
Jumping off train in motion	2	27	1	17		1	3	45
Attempt to board train in motion	1	12	1	16		1	2	29
Washout		6		4		11		21
Bridge gave way or burnt			1	1			1	1
Electrocuted			2				2	
Run down by engine or car	1	6	32	33		2	33	41
Passing too close around end of string of cars				2				2
Caught in frog, guard rail or switch rod				1				1
Caught while throwing switch				1				1
Falling off cars while climbing ladders			1	6			1	6
Falling off cars while working hand brake			1	6			1	6
Asphyxiated in tunnel								
Handling freight				20		1		21
Handling O. C. S. material				68				68
Building and repairing				13				13
Working in coal chute			1	7			1	7
Cars moved while loading and unloading				7		2		9
Drawbridge open								
Repairing cars on running track when moved by engine				2				2
Locomotive dropping crown sheet of fire box				3				3
	8	239	99	873	230	251	337	1,363

THE BOARD OF RAILWAY COMMISSIONERS FOR CANADA.

No. 4.—STATEMENT showing the character of Accidents sustained by the Persons Killed and Injured on the various Railways under the jurisdiction of the Board for the Year ending March 31, 1915.

Name of Railway.	Derailment.		Collision head-on.		Collision rear-end.		Collision in yard.		Collision with cars standing foul of main line.		Collision with cars account open switch.		Collision at level crossing.		Public highway crossing protected by gates.		Public highway crossing protected by bell.	
	K.	I.	K.	I.	K.	I.	K.	I.	K.	I.	K.	I.	K.	I.	K.	I.	K.	I.
Grand Trunk	...	55	2	32	...	24	2	41	...	2	...	3	...	17	5	8	2	1
Canadian Pacific	6	10	...	3	1	2	...	4	...	...	...	...	...	3	...	2	...	4
Canadian Northern	...	1	...	11	3	4	1	...	...	...	...	1	2	1	1	...	...	...
Grand Trunk Pacific	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	4	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...
Toronto, Hamilton and Buffalo	...	3	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...
Canadian Northern Quebec	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...
Pere Marquette	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	1	...	...	...	...	...	1	...	...	...	1
Michigan Central	...	2	...	...	...	...	...	2	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...
Quebec, Montreal and Southern	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...
Dominion Atlantic	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...
Central Vermont	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...
Atlantic, Quebec and Western	...	1	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...
Halifax and South Western	...	...	...	....	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...
Central Ontario	...	...	...	....	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...
Chatham, Wallaceburg and Lake Erie	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...
Esquimalt and Nanaimo	1	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...
Algoma Eastern	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...
Quebec and Lake St. John	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...
Winnipeg Joint Terminals	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...
Windsor, Essex and Lake Shore	...	...	...	...	...	16	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...
Erie and Ontario	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...
Algoma Central and Hudson Bay	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	2	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...
Morrissey, Fernie and Michel	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...
Ottawa and New York	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...
Brantford and Hamilton Electric	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...
Wabash	...	...	...	...	3	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...
Canadian Northern Ontario	...	9	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...
St. Lawrence and Adirondack	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	1
Niagara, St. Catharines and Toronto	...	...	...	...	...	2	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...
Quebec Oriental	...	...	...	...	...	1	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...
Vancouver, Victoria and Eastern	...	1	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...
Boston and Maine	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...
	7	82	2	46	7	49	3	54	...	2	...	4	2	22	6	10	2	7

THE BOARD OF RAILWAY COMMISSIONERS FOR CANADA.

No. 4.—STATEMENT showing the character of Accidents sustained by the Persons Killed and Injured on the various Railways under the jurisdiction of the Board for the Year ending March 31, 1915.

Name of Railway.	Public highway crossing protected by watchman.		Public highway crossing unprotected.		Private crossing.		Trespassing.		Working on or under engine.		Unclassified.		Adjusting couplers, coupling and uncoupling.		Working on track or bridge.		Falling off hand car, motor or velocipede.		Hand car motor, velocipede struck by train.	
	K.	I.	K.	I.	K.	I.	K.	I.	K.	I.	K.	I.	K.	I.	K.	I.	K.	I.	K.	I.
Grand Trunk	2	2	15	31	2	2	71	43	1	13	4	78	2	18	...	19	...	2	...	...
Canadian Pacific	...	1	15	18	...	...	72	44	...	2	4	17	1	3	2	6	4	4	3	3
Canadian Northern	...	...	1	6	...	...	6	13	1	20	4	61	1	4	...	29	...	12	...	3
Grand Trunk Pacific	...	...	...	...	...	...	2	5	...	6	...	9	...	3	1	10	...	6	...	1
Toronto, Hamilton and Buffalo	...	...	...	...	...	...	3	3	...	...	...	9	1	...	...	8	...	1	...	...
Canadian Northern Quebec	...	...	...	...	...	...	5	2	...	...	...	3	...	1	...	2	...	...	...	...
Pere Marquette	...	1	...	...	...	...	1	4	...	2	...	12	...	1	...	6	...	1	...	...
Michigan Central	...	1	1	4	...	...	3	2	...	7	...	5	...	1	...	...	...	...	...	...
Quebec, Montreal and Southern	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...
Dominion Atlantic	...	...	...	...	1	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	1	...	...	...	...	...	...
Central Vermont	...	...	...	1	...	...	...	1	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...
Atlantic, Quebec and Western	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...
Halifax and South Western	...	...	...	1	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	1	...	...	...	...	...	...
Central Ontario	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	2	...
Chatham, Wallaceburg and Lake Erie	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...
Esquimalt and Nanaimo	...	...	...	...	...	...	1	2	...	...	...	...	...	1	...	...	...	...	...	...
Algoma Eastern	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	1	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...
Quebec and Lake St. John	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...
Winnipeg Joint Terminals	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...
Windsor, Essex and Lake Shore	...	...	...	4	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...
Erie and Ontario	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	1	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...
Algoma Central and Hudson Bay	...	...	...	...	...	...	1	...	...	...	...	...	...	1	...	...	...	...	...	...
Morrissey, Fernie and Michel	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	1	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...
Ottawa and New York	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	1	...	...	...	2	2	1	...	...	...	...	...	...
Brantford and Hamilton Elec	...	...	1	2	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...
Wabash	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	1	...	4	...	1	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...
Canadian Northern Ontario	...	...	2	1	...	...	3	4	...	...	...	...	...	1	...	1	...	...	...	...
St. Lawrence and Adirondack	...	...	...	...	...	...	1	1	...	...	...	3	...	...	...	2	...	...	...	...
Niagara, St. Catharines and Toronto	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...
Quebec Oriental	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...
Vancouver, Victoria and Eastern	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	6	...	1	...	3	...	...	...	...
Boston and Maine	...	...	2	...	...	...	1	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...
	2	5	37	68	3	2	170	126	2	55	12	208	7	38	3	86	4	26	5	9

THE BOARD OF RAILWAY COMMISSIONERS FOR CANADA.

No. 4.—STATEMENT showing the character of Accidents sustained by the Persons Killed and Injured on the various Railways under the jurisdiction of the Board for the Year ending March 31, 1915.

Name of Railway.	Crawling under cars.		Crawling through cars over couplers.		Caught while passing cars between couplers.		Cars standing foul.		Struck by switch stand, water spout, mail crane, etc.		Crushed between cars, building, lumber piles, etc.		Explosion of locomotive boiler.		Falling off passenger train.		Falling off tender while handling coal.	
	K.	I.	K.	I.	K.	I.	K.	I.	K.	I.	K.	I.	K.	I.	K.	I.	K.	I.
Grand Trunk	....	....	1	....	....	2	....	3	....	2	....	2	....	....	2	5	....	5
Canadian Pacific	....	....	....	....	....	2	....	....	1	....	....	1	....	....	1	4	....	....
Canadian Northern	....	....	....	....	1	....	....	1	....	....	....	2	....	....	....	2	....	1
Grand Trunk Pacific	....	....	....	....	....	....	....	1	....	....	....	....	....	....	....	....	....	....
Toronto, Hamilton and Buffalo	....	....	....	....	....	....	....	....	....	1	....	....	....	....	....	....	....	....
Canadian Northern Quebec	....	....	....	....	....	....	....	1	....	....	....	....	....	....	....	....	....	....
Pere Marquette	....	....	....	....	....	....	....	....	....	1	....	....	....	....	....	....	....	....
Michigan Central	....	....	....	1	....	....	....	....	....	1	....	1	....	....	....	....	....	....
Quebec, Montreal and Southern	....	....	....	....	....	....	....	....	....	....	....	....	....	....	....	....	....	....
Dominion Atlantic	....	....	....	....	....	....	....	....	....	....	....	....	....	....	....	....	....	....
Central Vermont	....	....	....	....	....	....	....	....	....	....	....	....	....	....	....	....	....	....
Atlantic, Quebec and Western	....	....	....	....	....	....	....	....	....	....	....	....	....	....	....	....	....	....
Halifax and South Western	....	....	....	....	....	....	....	....	....	....	....	....	....	....	....	....	....	....
Central Ontario	....	....	....	....	....	....	....	....	....	....	....	....	....	....	....	....	....	....
Chatham, Wallaceburg and Lake Erie	....	....	....	....	....	....	....	....	....	1	....	....	....	....	....	....	....	....
Esquimalt and Nanaimo	....	....	....	....	....	....	....	....	....	....	....	....	....	....	....	....	....	....
Algoma Eastern	....	....	....	....	....	....	....	....	....	....	....	....	....	....	....	....	....	....
Quebec and Lake St. John	....	1	....	....	....	....	....	....	....	....	....	....	....	....	....	....	....	....
Winnipeg Joint Terminals	....	....	....	....	....	....	....	....	....	....	....	1	....	....	....	....	....	....
Windsor, Essex and Lake Shore	....	....	....	....	....	....	....	....	....	....	....	....	....	....	....	....	....	....
Erie and Ontario	....	....	....	....	....	....	....	....	....	....	....	....	....	....	....	....	....	....
Algoma Central and Hudson Bay	....	....	....	....	....	....	....	....	....	....	....	....	....	....	....	....	....	....
Morrissey, Fernie and Michel	....	....	....	....	....	....	....	....	....	....	....	....	....	....	....	....	....	....
Ottawa and New York	....	....	....	....	....	....	....	....	....	....	....	....	....	....	....	....	....	....
Brantford and Hamilton Elec	....	....	....	....	....	....	....	....	....	....	....	....	....	....	....	....	....	....
Wabash	....	....	....	....	....	....	....	....	....	....	....	1	....	....	....	....	....	....
Canadian Northern Ontario	....	....	....	....	....	....	....	....	....	1	....	1	....	....	....	....	....	....
St. Lawrence and Adirondack	....	....	....	....	....	....	....	....	....	....	....	....	....	....	....	....	....	....
Niagara, St. Catharines and Toronto	....	....	....	....	....	....	....	....	....	....	....	....	....	....	....	....	....	....
Quebec Oriental	....	....	....	....	....	....	....	....	....	....	....	....	....	....	....	....	....	....
Vancouver, Victoria and Eastern	....	....	....	....	....	....	....	....	....	1	....	....	....	....	....	....	....	....
Boston and Maine	....	....	....	....	....	....	....	1	....	....	....	....	....	....	....	....	....	....
	....	1	1	1	1	4	....	7	1	8	....	9	....	....	3	11	....	6

THE BOARD OF RAILWAY COMMISSIONERS FOR CANADA.

No. 4.—STATEMENT showing the character of Accidents sustained by the Persons Killed and Injured on the various Railways under the jurisdiction of the Board for the Year ending March 31, 1915.

Name of Railway.	Falling off tender while taking water.		Working in shop.		Riding on pilot of engine.		Overhead bridge.		Repairing cars on repair track when moved by engine.		Falling off top of car while walking over train.		Falling between cars going over top.		Train parting and colliding.		Jumping off train in motion.		Attempt to board train in motion.	
	K.	I.	K.	I.	K.	I.	K.	I.	K.	I.	K.	I.	K.	I.	K.	I.	K.	I.	K.	I.
Grand Trunk		3	2	13	1	2					1	12		1			1	15	1	5
Canadian Pacific		1	2	2				1			3	5	1	1	1	2	1	17	1	11
Canadian Northern				18		2						1	1	1			1	7		1
Grand Trunk Pacific						1						2								1
Toronto, Hamilton and Buffalo				8						1						1				
Canadian Northern Quebec				3														3		
Pere Marquette		2		14		1						1						1		1
Michigan Central				7	1															
Quebec, Montreal and Southern		1																		
Dominion Atlantic																				1
Central Vermont																				
Atlantic, Quebec and Western																				
Halifax and South Western																				
Central Ontario																				
Chatham, Wallaceburg and Lake Erie																				
Esquimalt and Nanaimo																				
Algoma Eastern																				
Quebec and Lake St. John																				
Winnipeg Joint Terminals																				
Windsor, Essex and Lake Shore																				
Erie and Ontario																				
Algoma Central and Hudson Bay																				
Morrissey, Fernie and Michel																				
Ottawa and New York																				
Brantford and Hamilton Elec																				
Wabash												1								
Canadian Northern Ontario																				
St. Lawrence and Adirondack																		1		
Niagara, St. Catharines and Toronto																				1
Quebec Oriental																				
Vancouver, Victoria and Eastern				2																
Boston and Maine				1														1		
		7	4	98	2	6		1		1	4	22	2	3	1	3	3	45	2	29

THE BOARD OF RAILWAY COMMISSIONERS FOR CANADA.

No. 4.—STATEMENT showing the character of Accidents sustained by the Persons Killed and Injured on the various Railways under the jurisdiction of the Board for the Year ending March 31, 1915.

Name of Railway.	Washout.		Bridge gave out or burnt.		Electrocuted.		Run down in yard by switch or other engines or moving cars.		Passing too close around end of string of cars.		Caught in frog, guard rail or switch rod.		Caught while throwing switch.		Falling off cars while climbing up and coming down side or end ladders.		Falling off cars while working hand brakes.	
	K.	I.	K.	I.	K.	I.	K.	I.	K.	I.	K.	I.	K.	I.	K.	I.	K.	I.
Grand Trunk					1		9	15						1	1	3	1	1
Canadian Pacific							16	15		1		1						3
Canadian Northern							2	2		1						1		
Grand Trunk Pacific		21					2	21										1
Toronto, Hamilton and Buffalo								1										
Canadian Northern Quebec			1	1			1	1										
Pere Marquette							1	1										
Michigan Central								1										
Quebec, Montreal and Southern																		
Dominion Atlantic																		
Central Vermont																		
Atlantic, Quebec and Western																		
Halifax and South Western																		
Central Ontario																		
Chatham, Wallaceburg and Lake Erie																		
Esquimalt and Nanaimo																		
Algoma Eastern																		
Quebec and Lake St. John																		
Winnipeg Joint Terminals															1			
Windsor, Essex and Lake Shore					1													
Erie and Ontario																		
Algoma Central and Hudson Bay																		
Morrissey, Fernie and Michel																		
Ottawa and New York								1							1			
Brantford and Hamilton Elec																		
Wabash							1											
Canadian Northern Ontario																		
St. Lawrence and Adirondack							1	1										
Niagara, St. Catharines and Toronto																		
Quebec Oriental																		
Vancouver, Victoria and Eastern								1										
Boston and Maine																		
		21	1	1	2		33	41		2		1		1	1	6	1	6

THE BOARD OF RAILWAY COMMISSIONERS FOR CANADA.

No. 4.—STATEMENT showing the character of Accidents sustained by the Persons Killed and Injured on the various Railways under the jurisdiction of the Board for the Year ending March 31, 1915.

Name of Railway.	Asphyxiated in tunnel.		Handling freight.		Loading and unloading O.C.S. material.		Building and repairing.		Working in coal chute.		Cars moved while loading and unloading.		Drawbridge open.		Repairing cars on running track when moved by engine.		Locomotive dropping crown sheet of firebox.		Total.	
	K.	I.	K.	I.	K.	I.	K.	I.	K.	I.	K.	I.	K.	I.	K.	I.	K.	I.	K.	I.
Grand Trunk				6		16		6		2		3							129	514
Canadian Pacific						4		2		1									135	198
Canadian Northern				4		22		4	1	1						1		1	26	275
Grand Trunk Pacific						3						4						2	5	84
Toronto, Hamilton and Buffalo				6		11		1		2									4	59
Canadian Northern Quebec				3		3						1							7	26
Pere Marquette				1		2													2	55
Michigan Central																1			5	36
Quebec, Montreal and Southern						1														2
Dominion Atlantic																			1	2
Central Vermont																				2
Atlantic, Quebec and Western																				1
Halifax and South Western																				2
Central Ontario																			2	
Chatham, Wallaceburg and Lake Erie																				1
Esquimalt and Nanaimo																			2	3
Algoma Eastern																				1
Quebec and Lake St. John																				1
Winnipeg Joint Terminals																				2
Windsor, Essex and Lake Shore																			1	20
Erie and Ontario																				1
Algoma Central and Hudson Bay																			1	3
Morrissey, Fernie and Michel																				1
Ottawa and New York																			2	6
Brantford and Hamilton Elec																			1	2
Wabash										1									4	9
Canadian Northern Ontario						1													5	19
St. Lawrence and Adirondaek				1		2						1							2	13
Niagara, St. Catharines and Toronto																				3
Quebec Oriental																				1
Vancouver, Victoria and Eastern						3														18
Boston and Maine																			3	3
				21	1	68		13	1	7		9				2		3	337	1,363

SESSIONAL PAPER No. 20c

THE BOARD OF RAILWAY COMMISSIONERS FOR CANADA.

No. 5.—COMPARATIVE statement in totals of killed and injured between year ending March 31, 1914, and year ending March 31, 1915, separately for each and every accident.

Character of Accidents.	1914.		1915.		1915. Increase.		1915. Decrease.	
	K.	I.	K.	I.	K.	I.	K.	I.
Derailment	39	257	7	82	....	....	32	175
Collision head on	7	29	2	46	.....	17	5	.....
Collision rear end	14	23	7	49	.....	26	7	.....
Collision in yard	18	55	3	54	.....	.....	15	1
Collision with cars standing foul of main track	.....	8	.....	2	.....	.....	.....	6
Collision with cars account open switch	5	17	.....	4	.....	.....	5	13
Collision at level crossing	1	39	2	22	1	.....	.....	13
Highway crossing protected by gates	10	13	6	10	.....	.....	4	7
Highway crossing protected by bell	1	6	2	7	1	1	.....	.....
Highway crossing protected by watchman	6	12	2	5	.....	.....	4	7
Highway crossing unprotected	44	84	37	68	.....	.....	7	16
Private crossing	2	3	3	2	1	.....	.....	1
Trespassing	238	164	170	126	.....	.....	68	38
Working on or under engine	6	92	2	55	.....	.....	4	37
Unclassified	29	293	12	208	.....	.....	17	85
Adjusting couplers, coupling and uncoupling	11	60	7	38	.....	.....	4	22
Working on track or bridge	18	117	3	86	.....	.....	15	31
Falling off hand car, motor or velocipede	2	30	4	26	2	.....	.....	4
Hand car, motor, velocipede struck by train	10	13	5	9	.....	.....	5	4
Crawling under cars	.....	3	.....	1	.....	.....	.....	2
Crawling between cars over coupler	.....	.....	1	1	1	1	.....	.....
Caught while passing through cars between couplers	6	4	1	4	.....	.....	5	.....
Cars standing foul	2	16	.....	7	.....	.....	2	9
Struck by switch stand, water spout, etc	4	21	1	8	.....	.....	3	13
Crushed between cars, buildings, platform, etc	4	7	.....	9	.....	2	4	.....
Explosion of locomotive boiler	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....
Falling off passenger trains	6	17	3	11	.....	.....	3	6
Falling off tender while handling coal	1	7	.....	6	.....	.....	1	1
Falling off tender while taking water	.....	6	.....	7	.....	1	.....	.....
Working in shop	.....	105	4	98	4	.....	.....	7
Riding on pilot of engine	3	14	2	6	.....	.....	1	8
Overhead bridge	2	3	.....	1	.....	.....	2	2
Repairing cars on repair track when moved by engine	1	4	.....	1	.....	.....	1	3
Falling off top of car while walking over train	4	41	4	22	.....	.....	.....	19
Falling between cars going over top	2	5	2	3	.....	.....	.....	2
Train parting and colliding	7	8	1	3	.....	.....	6	5
Jumping off train in motion	7	55	3	45	.....	.....	5	26
Attempt to board train in motion	8	47	2	29	.....	.....	6	18
Washout	.....	.....	.....	21	.....	21	.....	.....
Bridge gave way or burnt	.....	.....	1	1	1	1	.....	.....
Electrocuted	2	.....	2	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....
Run down by engine or car	56	64	33	41	.....	.....	23	23
Passing too close around end of cars	1	1	.....	2	.....	1	1	.....
Caught in frog, guard rail or switch rod	1	4	.....	1	.....	.....	1	3
Caught while throwing switch	.....	1	.....	1	.....	.....	.....	.....
Falling off cars while climbing ladders	.....	13	1	6	1	.....	.....	7
Falling off cars while working hand brake	2	12	1	6	.....	.....	1	6
Asphyxiated	1	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	1	.....
Handling freight	1	45	.....	21	.....	.....	1	24
Handling O.C.S. material	3	50	.....	68	.....	18	3	.....
Building and repairing	.....	10	.....	13	.....	3	.....	.....
Working in coal chute	1	7	1	7	.....	.....	.....	.....
Cars moved while loading or unloading	1	6	.....	9	.....	3	1	.....
Drawbridge open	1	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	1	.....
Repairing cars on running track when moved by engine	4	4	....	2	.....	.....	4	2
Locomotive dropped crown sheet of fire box	2	4	.....	3	....	.....	2	1
	594	1,899	337	1,363	12	95	269	631
	337	1,363	.....	.....	.....	.....	12	95
Decrease	257	536	.....	.....	.....	.....	257	536

THE BOARD OF RAILWAY COMMISSIONERS FOR CANADA.

No. 6.—COMPARATIVE statement in totals of killed and injured between year ending March 31, 1914 and year ending March 31, 1915, for each railway separately.

Name of Railway.	1914.		1915.		1915. Increase.		1915. Decrease.	
	K.	I.	K.	I.	K.	I.	K.	I.
Grand Trunk	171	448	129	514		66	42	
Canadian Pacific	315	482	135	198			180	284
Canadian Northern	24	306	26	275	2			31
Grand Trunk Pacific	17	157	5	84			12	73
Toronto, Hamilton and Buffalo	7	135	4	59			3	76
Canadian Northern Quebec	10	55	7	26			3	29
Pere Marquette	4	54	2	55		1	2	
Algoma Central and Hudson Bay	1		1	3		3		
London & Lake Erie	1						1	
Winnipeg Joint Terminals		23		2				21
Atlantic, Quebec and Western	1			1		1	1	
Wabash	1	12	4	9	3			3
Quebec, Montreal and Southern	2	11		2			2	9
Windsor, Essex and Lake Shore	1	1	1	20		19		
New Brunswick and P. E. I.		1						1
British Columbia	1						1	
Michigan Central	11	53	5	36			6	17
Moncton and Buctouche	4	2					4	2
Central Ontario	2	1	2					1
Central Vermont	8	16		2			8	14
Dominion Atlantic		3	1	2	1			1
Temiscouata	1						1	
St. Lawrence and Adirondack		14	2	13	2			1
Morrissey, Fernie and Michel	1	13		1			1	12
Vancouver, Victoria and Eastern	2	19		18			2	3
Boston and Maine		4	3	3	3			1
Maine Central		4						4
Ottawa and New York		9	2	6	2			3
Niagara, St. Catharines and Toronto	2	1		3		2	2	
Canadian Northern Ontario	2	66	5	19	3			47
Montreal and Southern Counties	1						1	
Bay of Quinte	1	7					1	7
Esquimalt and Nanaimo	3	2	2	3		1	1	
Algoma Eastern				1		1		
Halifax and South Western				2		2		
Chatham, Wallaceburg and Lake Erie				1		1		
Quebec and Lake St. John				1		1		
Erie and Ontario				1		1		
Brantford and Hamilton			1	2	1	2		
Quebec Oriental				1		1		
	594	1,899	337	1,363	17	102	274	638
	337	1,363					17	102
Decrease	257	536					257	536

SESSIONAL PAPER No. 20c

THE BOARD OF RAILWAY COMMISSIONERS FOR CANADA.

No. 7.—STATEMENT showing collisions attended by personal injury investigated during year ending March 31, 1915.

File.	Date.	Railway.	Place.	Killed.	Injured.
Inv.	1914.				
3369	Feb. 17	G.T.R.	Granton, 4 miles east		1
3378	Mar. 7	G.T.R.	St. Catharines, Ont		3
3383	Mar. 7	Q.O.R.	Matapedia, Warren's Crossing		1
3390	Jan. 21	G.T.R.	North Bay, Ont	1	
3392	Mar. 12	G.T.R.	Fort Erie, Ont		1
3394	Mar. 3	G.T.R.	Fort Erie Yard		2
3490	June 9	W. E. & L. S	Essex, Naylor's Curve		1
3493	July 13	C.N.R.	Edmonton Yard, west end	1	
3516	July 21	G.T.P.	Rivers Yard		2
3522	June 5	C.N.R.	Cote Siding, 7 poles east	3	4
3529	July 25	C.N.R.	Humbolt, Sask		1
3578	Aug. 28	C.P.R.	Westmount Yard, Quebec		1
3584	Sept. 2	G.T.R.	Komoka		25
3591	Aug. 15	G.T.P.	Transcona		1
3592	July 17	G.T.P.	Redditt		1
3628	Oct. 15	P.M.R.	St. Thomas, Wilson Avenue Crossing		1
3632	Oct. 22	C.P.R.	Fredericton		2
3640	Sept. 17	C.P.R.	Rossport, Ont		3
3647	Nov. 5	G.T.R	St. Henri, Que		8
3690	Nov. 10	C.P.R.	Guelph Junction		1
3697	Nov. 11	G.T.R.	Tiffin Yard, Ont	1	
3707	Dec. 5	G.T.R.	Toronto		1
3724	Dec. 10	Wabash	Darling Road, 4 miles east		3
3735	Nov. 24	G.T.R.	Merritton		8
3737	Dec. 19	G.T.R.	Badger's Cut, Ont		1
3738	Dec. 1	G.T.R	Campbellford, 4 miles east		3
3747	Dec. 10	G.T.R.	Sarnia Tunnel		1
3754	Dec. 12	A.C. & H.B	Frank		2
3756	Dec. 12	G.T.R.	Windsor		3
3759	Dec. 14	G.T.R.	Near Welland	9	4
3723	Dec. 30	G.T.R.	Merritton, Ont		2
3504	July 10	G.T.R.	Callender, Ont		3
3513	Aug. 3	N. St. C. & T.	Thorold, Ball's Crossing		2
3536	July 23	G.T.R. & St. Ry	London West Rectory Street		7
3550	June 21	G.T.R.	Kinburn, 1½ miles west	2	2
3742	Nov. 23	G.T.R.	Preston, Ont, ½ mile south		2
3469	May 29	G.T.R.	Palmerston, Ont		2
3761	Dec. 31	M.C.R	St. Thomas Yard		2
3765	Dec. 26	G.T.R.	Blackwater Junction		3
3769	Jan. 13	C.N.R.	Edmonton Yard		1
3786	Dec. 7	P.M.R.	Montrose		1
3788	Feb. 10	C.N.R.	St. James east distant semaphore		10
3797	Feb. 2	G.T.R.	Montreal Bonaventure Seigneur Street	1	30
3807	Feb. 23	G.T.R.	Killaloe, Ont		2
3811	Jan. 19	G.T.R.	Coteau Junction Yard		2
3815	Mar. 2	G.T.R. & St. Ry	Montreal, Cote St. Paul Road		4
3827	Dec. 22	C.P.R	Glen River		1
3829	Feb. 2	C.P.R.	Mileage 57·7, Trenton, S.D	1	1
3403	April 22	C.P.R. & St. Ry	Fairville (West St. John)		3

Total number of investigations 49
Total killed 19
Total injured 165

THE BOARD OF RAILWAY COMMISSIONERS FOR CANADA.

No. 8.—STATEMENT showing derailments attended by personal injury investigated during year ending March 31, 1915.

File.	Date.	Railway.	Place.	Killed.	Injured.
Inv.	1914.				
3368	Feb. 18	T.H. & B.	Hamilton Tunnel Junction		1
3385	Jan. 5	C.P.R.	Mileage 51, Ignace S.D.		1
3407	Mar. 25	G.T.R.	South River, near		1
3417	April 17	G.T.R.	Brantford, Ont.		1
3431	April 19	G.T.R.	Montreal, Point St. Charles		1
3443	Feb. 20	M. & B. Ry.	Scotch Settlement Station	4	2
3450	May 9	G.T.R.	Richmond, Que.		31
3452	May 14	M.C.R.	Buxton		2
3477	June 12	G.T.R.	Wingham, Ont.		2
3487	June 14	G.T.R.	Bromptonville, Que.		3
3557	Aug. 14	C.N.O.	Erinsville		4
3565	Sept. 3	C.N.R.	Browns Hill, near Enterprise		5
3567	July 5	G.T.R.	Maple Lake, Ont.		1
3588	Sept. 16	G.T.R.	St. Catharines, Ont.		1
3627	Sept. 15	C.P.R.	Mileage 22·5, Toronto, S.D.		2
3630	Sept. 8	C.P.R.	Balliver, 1 mile west	1	
3638	Oct. 6	C.P.R.	Mileage 86, 2 poles east Laggan, S.D.	1	
3667	Oct. 17	G.T.R.	Mimico, Manufacturers' Siding		1
3674	Nov. 3	G.T.R.	Belleville, Ont.		1
3677	Oct. 7	G.T.P.	Rea, Man.		1
3680	Nov. 13	C.N.R.	Mileage 216, 8 poles south of		3
3696	Nov. 2	C.P.R.	Mileage 39, Cascade, S.D.	3	
3441	April 2	C.N.Q.	Edmonton, east end of yard		1
3409	Mar. 19	G.T.R.	Dorval, Que.		1
3497	July 16	C.P.R.	Mile 67		1
3510	July 29	T.N. & B.	Aberdeen Yard		2
3792	Feb. 3	G.T.R.	Listowel		2
3793	Feb. 1	G.T.R.	Listowel		2
3795	Nov. 20	E. & N.	Mile Post 22, south of	1	
3798	Feb. 16	C.P.R.	Mile 13, Govenlock, S.D.	1	1
3799	Nov. 20	V.V. & E.	White Rock, 3 miles north		1
3804	Feb. 2	G.T.R.	Welland, Ont.		1
3805	Feb. 2	G.T.R.	Seaforth, Ont.		4
3806	Feb. 2	T.H. & B.	Coyle Yard, Hamilton, Ont.		1

Total number of investigations	34
Total killed	11
Total injured	81

SESSIONAL PAPER No. 20c

THE BOARD OF RAILWAY COMMISSIONERS FOR CANADA.

No. 9.—STATEMENT showing highway crossing accidents attended by personal injury investigated during year ending March 31, 1915.

File.	Date.	Railway.	Place.	Killed.	Injured.
Inv.	1914.				
3366	Mar. 5	M.C.R.	Iona, Main Road crossing		1
3376	Mar. 11	G.T.R.	Montreal, St. Henri Place		1
3384	Mar. 18	G.T.R.	Tecumseh, Pike creek	1	
3386	Mar. 17	G.T.R.	Port Hope, John Street crossing		1
3389	Mar. 21	G.T.R.	Near Stoney Creek, Harris public		1
3396	Mar. 27	G.T.R.	Hamburg, Waterloo Street crossing		1
3398	Mar. 9	G.T.R.	Toronto, Bloor Street crossing	1	
3402	Mar. 27	C.P.R.	Mileage 45, Glen Norman	1	
3416	April 15	G.T.R.	Berlin, Wilmot Street crossing		1
3429	May 2	G.T.R.	London, William Street crossing	1	
3432	April 22	M.C.R.	Bridgeburg, Thompson Road crossing		1
3433	April 15	G.T.R.	Toronto, Jones Avenue crossing		1
3434	Mar. 12	G.T.R.	Waterville, Town Hall crossing		1
3438	April 23	G.T.R.	Simcoe, Norfolk Street		1
3436	May 19	M.C.R.	Harwick, crossing west of Mull		1
3447	May 21	G.T.R.	Brampton, James Street crossing second east		1
3455	May 20	G.T.R.	Lindsay, South Junction	1	
3456	May 30	G.T.R.	Montreal, Guy Street crossing		1
3457	May 28	C.P.R.	Quebec, Dorchester Street crossing		1
3459	May 1	C.P.R.	West Toronto, Royce Avenue crossing		1
3460	June 1	G.T.R.	Toronto, Cherry Street crossing		1
3461	May 30	G.T.R.	Lachine, Brewster avenue	1	
3462	May 16	G.T.R.	Seaforth, crossing east of		1
3463	May 9	G.T.R.	St. Pauls Station, crossing west of		1
3470	June 6	G.T.R.	Lancaster, public crossing	1	
3482	June 11	G.T.R.	Hamilton, Wentworth street		1
3483	July 14	C.N.R.	Tp. of Gillimsbury, south Mount Albert station	2	
3485	June 9	G.T.R.	Montreal, Fulford Street crossing		1
3486	July 3	G.T.R.	Shallow Lake, crossing ½ mile north		2
3488	June 27	C.P.R.	Mileage 76, Edmonton, S.D.	2	
3489	July 2	G.T.R.	Hamilton, Ottawa Street crossing	1	
3491	July 1	G.T.R.	Peterboro, public crossing 1 mile east	1	1
3496	July 6	C.P.R.	Toronto, MacLennan avenue	1	
3499	June 25	C.P.R.	Fassett, crossing 1 mile west	2	
3500	July 13	C.P.R.	Quebec, Belle Road crossing	1	
3501	July 16	C.P.R.	Calgary, 8th Street East	1	
3502	July 14	G.T.R.	Lansdowne, first crossing west		1
3505	June 13	C.N.R.	Fort William, Miles street		4
3511	Aug. 3	B. & M.	Ayers Cliff, first crossing south	2	
3512	June 22	C.N.R.	West Fort William, Gore street	1	
3524	July 31	C.P.R.	Scarboro, T.P.		1
3525	July 2	C.N.R.	Melfort crossing		1
3526	Aug. 17	C.P.R.	Toronto West, Road crossing Weston		1
3531	Aug. 17	C.P.R.	Winnipeg, Robinson avenue		1
3564	Aug. 19	M.C.R.	St. Thomas, Queen Street crossing		1
3575	Sept. 1	C.P.R.	St. Johns, Jacques Cartier		1
3580	Aug. 24	G.T.R.	Sarnia, Divine Street		2
3585	Aug. 27	C.N.R.	Near M. P. 236, Port Arthur, S.D.		1
3595	Sept. 11	C.P.R.	Birchton, crossing between lots 15 and 16	1	
3597	Sept. 29	G.T.R.	Strathmore, crossing just west station	1	
3604	Sept. 11	C.P.R.	Dixie Station, Mileage 12·61	1	
3607	Oct. 1	G.T.R.	Montreal, crossing east Bridge street		1
3610	Oct. 3	G.T.R.	Ste. Hyacinthe, Bertrands crossing		1
3613	Oct. 1	G.T.R.	Lachine, Que., 18th Avenue	1	
3614	Oct. 2	W.E. & L.S.	Windsor, Gravel Road crossing		1

THE BOARD OF RAILWAY COMMISSIONERS FOR CANADA.

No. 9.—STATEMENT showing highway crossing accidents attended by personal injury investigated during the year ending March 31, 1915.

File.	Date.	Railway.	Place.	Killed.	Injured.
Iav.					
3617	July 2	C.P.R.	Mortlack, Government Road crossing	1	
3618	Oct. 2	C.N.R.	Winnipeg, Portage avenue	2	1
3621	Oct. 6	B. & H.E. Ry	Ancaster, crossing between lots 47 and 48	1	2
3622	Oct. 9	G.T.R.	Hamilton, crossing Barton street		1
3624	Sept. 20	W.E. & L.S.	Ruthven crossing lots 10 and 9		3
3625	Sept. 17	G.T.R.	Amigari, crossing at station		1
3635	Sept. 21	G.T.R.	King, Crawfords crossing	1	
3639	Oct. 27	G.T.R.	Morrisburg, first public west		1
3641	Sept. 23	C.N.R.	Delisle, Main street		1
3648	Oct. 22	G.T.R.	Ningara Falls, March crossing		2
3649	Oct. 22	G.T.R.	Brantford, Toll Gate crossing		2
3650	Oct. 13	G.T.R.	Moborough, first public crossing west		1
3654	Nov. 9	G.T.R.	Toronto, Strachan avenue		1
3657	Oct. 23	C.P.R.	Toronto, Church street		1
3658	Nov. 6	C.P.R.	Knowlton, Victoria St. level crossing, mil. 6·86		1
3664	Oct. 11	G.T.R.	Hamilton, Wellington street		1
3665	Oct. 30	G.T.R.	Hamilton, Ferguson avenue		1
3679	Oct. 21	C.P.R.	Chatham, Lavoire street		1
3682	Nov. 13	G.T.R.	Dominion, Second Avenue crossing	1	
3683	Nov. 20	M.C.R.	Tillsonburg, first road crossing	1	
3684	Nov. 9	C.P.R.	Winchester, first crossing		1
3685	Oct. 31	M.C.R.	London, Colborne street		1
3686	Oct. 7	G.T.R.	Grimsby, crossing east station		1
3687	Dec. 1	C.P.R.	Ottawa, Ridgemont, crossing Bank St., mil. 1·26	1	
3689	Nov. 25	C.P.R.	Quebec, St. Martin		1
3691	Nov. 17	C.P.R.	Lambton, Dundas road		1
3692	Nov. 25	G.T.R.	Rideau, public crossing east ½ mile	1	1
3704	Dec. 9	G.T.R.	Near Vankleek Hill, Ont., Brick Yard	3	
3716	Nov. 25	G.T.R.	Montreal, Atwater Avenue	1	
3718	Nov. 27	G.T.R.	Toronto, Royce Avenue	1	
3722	Nov. 10	C.N.R.	Markham, bet. Thornlea and Richmond		1
3725	Nov. 23	G.T.R.	Sundridge Street crossing at north end	1	
3728	Nov. 19	C.P.R.	Cooksville Station, Dundas Road		1
3730	Nov. 20	G.T.R.	Meaford, Bridge St. crossing, Ont.	1	
3733	Dec. 18	C.N.R.	Edmonton, Ottawa avenue		1
3736	Dec. 14	G.T.R.	London, Edgerton Street crossing	2	
3739	Nov. 19	C.P.R.	St. Marys, first crossing west, mil. 2337		1
3740	Dec. 6	C.P.R.	Missouri, third crossing west, mil. 106·6	1	1
3743	Dec. 12	G.T.R.	Montreal, Vinet Street crossing	1	
3751	Dec. 7	G.T.R.	St. Thomas, 2½ miles west		2
3753	Dec. 6	G.T.R.	St. Henri, St. Phillippe Street crossing		1
3758	Dec. 16	G.T.R.	Hamilton, Rebecca Street crossing		1
3426	Mar. 20	C.N.R.	Mileage 35, first crossing east of station, Dunmor, Sask		2
3430	April 25	C.P.R.	Chatham, Queens Street crossing		1
3473	June 21	N.Y.C. & H. R.	St. Timothee, crossing 300 feet south		1
3551	Aug. 7	G.T.R.	Newstadt, Hoggman's crossing		1
3411	April 8	G.T.R.	Wyoming, Main Street crossing	1	
3762	Dec. 25	G.T.R.	Simcoe Union Street crossing	1	
3766	Dec. 21	C.P.R.	Lake Shore Junction		1
3770	Dec. 28	G.T.R.	Galt, Kerr Street crossing		1
3772	Dec. 28	C.P.R.	Berthier, Public Road crossing Grand Cote		1
3774	Dec. 1	C.P.R.	Mil. 44·20 Mail Road crossing		1
3776	Dec. 16	C.N.R.	Elgin, 1 mile west about mil. 62·5		1
3780	Jan. 23	G.T.R.	Brampton, first crossing west	1	
3791	Feb. 10	M.C.R.	Stevensville, street west of		2
3821	Feb. 22	G.T.R.	Hamilton, Sherman avenue		1
3823	Mar. 13	G.T.R.	London, Clarence street		1
3825	Mar. 11	C.P.R.	Drummondville Junction, Main road		1
3832	Feb. 10	H. & S.W.	Bridgewater, Baker's crossing		1
3812	Mar. 7	C.P.R.	Leonard Station, crossing west		1

Total number of investigations 115
Total killed 48
Total injured 93

No. 10.—STATEMENT showing various other Accidents attended by Personal Injury Investigated during Year ending March 31, 1915.

File.	Date.	Railway.	Place.	Remarks.	Killed.	Injured.
Inv.	1914.					
3367	Mar. 12	C.P.R.	Central Ontario Junction	Taking signals from brakeman		1
3370	Jan. 31	G.T.P.	M.P. 153·6 Regina Bdry	Fell from engine		1
3371	Mar. 6	G.T.R.	Mimico, Ont	Crushed between cars		1
3372	Feb. 19	G.T.R.	Toronto West	Slipped, getting cars off scales siding		1
3373	Mar. 10	C.P.R.	McAdam Junction yard	Giving signals struck by engine		1
3374	Mar. 21	C.P.R.	Laurentian S.D. mil. 25	Jumped off train		1
3375	Mar. 24	C.N.R.	Montreal, Lakefield plant	Attempted to uncouple cars		1
3377	Mar. 20	C.N.Q.	Grand Mere yard	Adjusting couplers		1
3379	Mar. 7	C.P.R.	McAdam Junction	Adjusting couplers		1
3380	Feb. 5	C.P.R.	McAdam Junction, N.B.	Ran in front of engine, slipped and fell		1
3381	Mar. 7	C.P.R.	Iberville	Struck by engine		1
3382	Mar. 23	C.P.R.	Mattawa	Jumped off train in motion	1	
3387	Feb. 20	G.T.R.	Toronto, Don	Was rolled between engine and tender		1
3388	Feb. 10	E. & N.R.	Chase River Bridge, mil. 70.6	Passing between cars in motion	1	
3391	Mar. 10	G.T.R.	Dorchester, Ont	Fell between engine and tender		1
3393	Mar. 2	G.T.R.	Paris Junction	Struck by train		1
3395	Feb. 19	C.P.R.	Fort William, Ont	Attempted to cut air hose, was thrown onto train		1
3397	Mar. 25	G.T.R.	York, Ont	Crossing tracks, struck by cars		1
3399	Feb. 24	M.C.R.	La Salette	Struck by train	1	
3400	Mar. 12	C.N.R.	Le Pas, Man	Uncoupling air hose		1
3401	Feb. 4	G.T.P.	Mission, Ont	Making drop of caboose		1
3404	Mar. 18	G.T.R.	Fort Erie, Ont	Switching		1
3405	April 2	T.H. & B.	Hamilton, Aberdeen yard	Fell off side of car		1
3406	Mar. 24	G.T.R.	Hamilton, Ont	Switching		1
3408	Mar. 9	G.T.R.	Hawkestone, Ont	Fingers caught in vestibule door		1
3410	April 4	C.P.R.	Smith's Falls, Ont	Jumped off engine		1
3412	April 11	G.T.R.	Malton, Ont	Jumped off train		1
3413	April 1	C.P.R.	Chapleau yard	Cars passed over legs	1	
3414	April 22	C.P.R.	West Toronto	Throwing switch		1
3415	April 3	M.C.R.	Victoria yard	Supposed to have gone between cars	1	
3418	April 25	P.E.R.	Springfield	Thrown over cupola		1
3419	Mar. 13	C.N.R.	Saskatoon yard	Getting off top of car		1
3420	Mar. 17	C.N.R.	Mil. 484, Battleford, st.	Getting out of cab window		1
3421	May 7	C.P.R.	Toronto, crossing at Bay st.	Attempted to get on car	1	
3422	April 21	C.P.R.	Mile End yard	Walking across inbound track	1	
3423	April 17	G.T.R.	Niagara Falls, Ont	Adjusting couplers	1	
3424	Mar. 26	G.T.P.	Melville, Sask	Riding on rear tender step of engine		1
3425	April 7	C.N.R.	Regina, Sask	Uncoupling steam hose		1
3427	Mar. 16	G.T.P.	Watrous yard, Sask	Unloading cinders		1
3428	Mar. 31	C.P.R.	Aroostook Junction	Struck by switch stand	1	

No. 10—STATEMENT showing various other Accidents attended by Personal Injury Investigated during Year ending March 31, 1915—*Con.*

File.	Date.	Railway.	Place.	Remarks.	Killed.	Injured.
Inv.	1914.					
3437	April 28.	C.N.R.	Sudbury Junction	Adjusting couplers		1
3438	Mar. 16.	C.P.R.	Westminster yard	Attempted to get off train in motion	1	
3439	April 5.	C.P.R.	North Bend yard, B.C.	Attempted to pass between cars	1	
3440	May 4.	G.T.P.	Mileage 290	Sand fill forming diversion river gave way		21
3442	April 8.	G.T.P.	Calgary, Alta.	Coupling		1
3444	May 11.	C.P.R.	Winnipeg, Man.	Struck by car		1
3445	April 25.	G.T.R.	Niagara Falls, Ont.	Fell off train		1
3446	May 21.	G.T.R.	Beaconsfield, Que.	Fell from cupola to floor of caboose		2
3448	May 27.	C.P.R.	Westmount station	Struck by engine		1
3449	May 23.	C.P.R.	Sortin South yard	Taking water, fell off tender		1
3451	May 5.	G.T.R.	Clifton Junction	Fell off car		1
3453	May 7.	G.T.R.	Waterdown, Ont.	Fell between cars	1	
3454	May 23.	P.M.R.	Blenheim Junction	Setting brakes to car		1
3458	April 27.	G.T.R.	Stouffville, Ont.	Struck by train		1
3464	May 10.	C.P.R.	Jerome ½ mile west	Struck by train	1	
3465	May 26.	O. & N.Y.	Cornwall, Ont.	Caught between couplers	1	
3466	April 29	G.T.P.	Gainford, Alta.	Engine struck rear end of train		1
3467	June 2.	C.P.R.	Winnipeg Exhibition sdg.	Run over	1	
3468	May 27.	C.N.Q.	Holdein siding	Crushed between cars		1
3472	June 19.	G.T.R.	Woodstock, Ont.	Thrown from cupola of caboose to floor		1
3474	June 13.	G.T.R.	Cornwall, Ont.	Jumped off train		1
3475	June 1.	G.T.R.	Montreal, Turcot	Jumped off train		1
3476	June 13.	C.P.R.	Ste. Agathe	Jumped off train		1
3478	June 9.	G.T.R.	Komoka, Ont.	Fell off car	1	
3479	June 11.	G.T.R.	Hamilton, Ont.	Fell off engine		1
3480	April 16.	C.N.R.	M.P. 320, Humboldt, S.D.	Jumped from engine		1
3481	May 14.	G.T.R.	Orillia yard, Ont.	Fell between engine and car		1
3484	June 9.	G.T.R.	Montreal, Pt. St. Charles	Struck by engine	1	
3492	June 12.	C.P.R.	Netiskow, Alta.	Thrown over end of car	1	
3494	June 22.	G.T.R.	Toronto, Ont.	Struck by engine	1	
3495	July 18.	C.P.R.	Havelock yard	Caught between couplers	1	
3498	July 2.	C.N.O.	Parry Sound yard	Struck by water stand pipe		1
3503	June 28.	C.P.R.	Ste. Agathe, Que.	Fell off train		1
3506	July 16.	G.T.R.	Georgetown	Fell from car		1
3507	July 17.	G.T.R.	Longwood, Ont.	Caught between couplers	1	
3508	July 18.	G.T.R.	Hamilton, Ont.	Fell off car		1
3509	July 22.	G.T.R.	Hamilton, Ont.	Thrown from car		1
3514	Aug. 7.	C.P.R.	Schreiber, engine shops	Working on train	1	
3515	April 27.	C.N.Q.	Prince Albert, east of	Front of engine struck plank		1
3517	July 22.	C.N.R.	Prince Albert, 4 miles S.	Water glass breaking		1

3518	July	15	C.N.R.	Prince Albert shops track	Hose in cab of engine burst			1
3519	June	2	C.N.R.	Morguay east end side track	Raising up draw bar			1
3520	July	30	G.T.R.	Scarboro	Struck by buffer of engine			1
3521	July	29	P.M.R.	MeGregor	Cutting off cars			1
3523	Aug.	10	G.T.R.	Longwood, Ont	Stepped on front of train		1	
3527	July	19	C.P.R.	Winnipeg, Transcona yard	Found on track		1	
3528	July	28	G.T.R.	Westford yard	Explosion in fire box		1	
3530	Aug.	9	C.N.Q.	Mileage 151	Engine tender and baggage car went through bridge		1	1
3532	July	25	N.Y. & H.	Cornwall	Fell in front of car		1	
3533	July	8	G.T.P.	Mile 407½ E. from P.R.	Thrown from engine			1
3534	July	29	G.T.R.	London, Maitland St. crossing	Wagon struck by engine			1
3535	Aug.	11	C.P.R.	Lovett, Alta	Cars got away after engines were cut off			1
3537	July	10	G.T.P.	Edson, Alta	Uncoupling cars			1
3538	July	24	G.T.R.	Sarnia Tunnel, Ont	Attempting to get on engine footboard			1
3539	July	29	G.T.R.	Montreal, Turcot West	Fell off car			1
3540	Aug.	14	B. & M.	Eustis, Que	Struck by car			1
3541	Aug.	24	C.N.Q.	Longue Pointe roundhouse	Stepped in front of engine			1
3542	Aug.	19	C.P.R.	St. Martin Junction	Jumped off train			1
3544	July	22	C.N.R.	Edmonton, West Lead	Riding on rear end of caboose			1
3543	Aug.	18	C.N.R.	Bet. mi. 36 & 37 west of Tollerton.	Fell between cars			1
3545	Aug.	6	C.N.R.	Edmonton Yard West Lead	Getting on rear footboard of engine			1
3546	Aug.	21	G.T.R.	Madawnska, Ont	Pulling pin between operating lever			1
3547	Aug.	18	G.T.R.	Montreal, Turcot	Struck by engine			1
3548	Sept.	1	W.J.T.	Winnipeg, J. T. yard	Attempted to climb onto cab			1
3549	Aug.	3	C.P.R.	Finch, ¼ mile east	Fell over bridge			1
3552	Aug.	22	G.T.R.	Toronto, Don Station	Fell off train		1	
3553	Aug.	28	T. H. & B.	Hamilton	Hughson Mt., going between cars, engine uncoupled			1
3554	Aug.	7	C.P.R.	Strathmore, Alta	Stealing ride			1
3555	Aug.	2	C.P.R.	Lukie, Alta	Fell off car		1	
3556	Aug.	18	C.P.R.	Port Arthur	Found lying on track			1
3558	July	25	D.A.R.	Newport	Fell between cars			1
3559	July	15	C.P.R.	Port Arthur, Ont	Uncoupling air hose		1	
3560	May	4	C.N.R.	Fort Frances	Run over by car			1
3561	June	25	C.N.R.	Rainy River yard	Uncoupling air hose			1
3562	Aug.	20	G.T.R.	Hagersville, Ont	Caught between cars			1
3563	July	21	Wabash	Port Robinson	Fell off top of car			1
3566	Aug.	18	G.T.R.	Jarvis, Ont	Struck by engine		1	
3568	Aug.	14	C.P.R.	Transcona yard, Man	Struck by car		1	1
3569	Aug.	28	Wabash	St. Thomas, Ont	Attempted to apply injector			1
3570	Aug.	20	G.T.R.	London, Ont	Footboard of engine caught in plank			1
3571	Aug.	31	G.T.R.	Chatham, Ont	Caught between engine and car			1
3572	Sept.	5	G.T.R.	Hamilton, Ont	Coupling			1
3573	Sept.	6	C.N.R.	Bedford, ½ mile east	Locomotive dropping crown sheet			1
3574	July	15	C.N.R.	Dauphin, ash pit track	Working injector and squirt hose blew off			1
3576	Sept.	8	C.P.R.	Quebec	Attempting to get on engine			1
3577	Aug.	24	C.P.R.	Hebert	Attempted to get off train			1
3579	Aug.	20	C.P.R.	Markey, crossing east	Fell off train			1
3581	Sept.	10	C.P.R.	Bisco, Ont	Struck by engine			1
3582	Sept.	7	A.C.R.	Stutton yard	Jumped off engine			1

No. 10—STATEMENT showing various other Accidents attended by Personal Injury Investigated during Year ending March 31, 1915—*Con.*

File.	Date.	Railway.	Place.	Remarks.	Killed.	Injured.
Inv.	1914.					
3583	Aug. 24	G.T.R.	Toronto, Ont	Adjusting couplers		1
3586	Sept. 2	G.T.R.	Tiffin yard, Ont	Buffer beam on tender of engine broke		1
3587	Sept. 11	G.T.R.	Drumbo, Ont	Uncoupling car from engine		1
3589	Sept. 11	G.T.R.	London East, Ont	Arch tube in engine burst		1
3590	Sept. 18	T.H. & B.	Smithville, ½ mile east of	Air hose burst		1
3593	Aug. 24	C.N.R.	Raddison, ½ mile east	Fell from train		1
3594	Aug. 27	G.T.R.	St. Bruno, Que.	Caught between baggage and second class		1
3596	Sept. 5	C.P.R.	Flesherton	Getting off train in motion		1
3598	Aug. 1	N.Y. & H.R.	St. Timothee	Struck by engine		1
3599	Aug. 16	G.T.P.	Endako, B.C	Fell off pilot of engine		1
3600	Aug. 1	G.T.P.	Fort Fraser, B.C	Uncoupling engine		1
3601	Sept. 24	G.T.R.	Toronto, Ont	Turning switch		1
3602	Aug. 18	C.P.R.	Goderich yard	Switching		1
3603	Sept. 16	G.T.R.	Findley, Ont	Jumped off train		1
3605	Sept. 23	C.N.R.	Meanock, Alta	Running along line to catch train, jumped in front of engine		1
3606	Sept. 18	C.N.R.	Edmonton shops	Fell into pit, struck head on rail		1
3608	Oct. 3	G.T.R.	Maxville, Ont	Standing on gang plank		1
3609	Sept. 25	C.N.R.	Edberg	Scalded with squirt hose		1
3611	Sept. 20	C.N.R.	Big Valley	Cylinder head blew out		1
3612	Aug. 21	C.N.R.	Bet. mile post 369 and 369, Calgary, S.D.	Dumping ashpan		1
3615	Sept. 23	G.T.R.	London East	Fell into ashpit		1
3616	Sept. 18	C.P.R.	Oak Lake	Fell between cars	1	
3619	July 26	G.T.R.	Findley, 3 miles west	Body found on track	1	
3620	Sept. 21	C.P.R.	Molson	Struck by cars and run over	1	
3623	Aug. 5	C.N.R.	Gypsumville	Running behind engine to throw switch	1	
3626	Oct. 10	G.T.R.	Point Claire, Que.	Jumped off train		1
3629	Oct. 9	C.P.R.	Caledon Station	Struck by train	1	
3631	Sept. 19	C.P.R.	Mil. 51 Kootenay Central S.D.	Run over	1	
3633	July 18	N.Y.C. & H.R.	Beauharnois, P.Q.	Jumped from moving train		1
3634	Aug. 5	N.Y.C. & H.R.	Huntington	Stepping from car to wagon		1
3636	Oct. 1	C.P.R.	Hartney yard, west end of	Attempted to board moving train		1
3637	Oct. 14	C.P.R.	Moose Jaw yards	Run over	1	
3642	Sept. 25	G.T.R.	Davisville, Ont	Switching		1
3643	Oct. 18	C.N.R.	Edmonton Stn. platform	Uncoupling steam hose		1
3644	Oct. 15	G.T.R.	Hyde Park Junction	Fell off train		1
3645	Sept. 22	C.N.R.	Tessier, Sask	Repairing car		1
3646	Oct. 7	G.T.R.	Lyndon Junction	Replacing crosshead key		1

3651	Oct. 24	G.T.R.	Stratford	Riding on pilot of engine	1		
3652	Nov. 5	C.P.R.	Toronto	Found on track		1	
3653	Nov. 2	C.N.R.	Vegreville	Caught between freight cars	1		
3655	Oct. 1	M.C.R.	Welland Station	Wheel of truck run over foot		1	
3656	Oct. 14	W.St.C.T.	Port Weller	Attempting to board train in motion		1	
3659	Nov. 2	G.T.R.	St. Lambert Junction	Struck by train		1	
3660	Nov. 5	G.T.R.	Montreal, Pt. St. Charles	Caught between coaches		1	
3661	Nov. 4	G.T.R.	Montreal, Turcot	Struck by engine		1	
3662	Nov. 16	C.P.R.	Buller	Fell off top of car		1	
3663	Oct. 1	C.P.R.	Handel	Attempted to board moving train	1		
3666	Oct. 1	G.T.R.	Sarnia Tunnel, Ont	Repairing electric bell, received internal shock	1		
3668	Oct. 24	G.T.R.	Barrie, Ont	Attempting to jump on train		1	
3669	Oct. 4	M.C.R.	Windsor yard, Ont	Shaking grates on engine		1	
3670	Oct. 3	M.C.R.	St. Thomas yard	Caught between couplers		1	
3671	Oct. 5	M.C.R.	St. Thomas, Ont	Knocked off car		1	
3672	Oct. 9	M.C.R.	Montrose yard, Ont	Standing on deck of engine		1	
3673	Nov. 3	C.P.R.	Lambton Roundhouse	Working on engine		1	
3675	Nov. 2	G.T.R.	Newmarket, Ont	Attempting to cross between cars, fell		1	
3676	Nov. 17	T.H. & B.	Brantford yards	Switching cars		1	
3678	Oct. 28	G.T.R.	Montreal, Turcot	Cleaning headlamp		1	
3681	Nov. 7	G.T.R.	Vaudreuil Bridge, Que	Struck by train	1		
3688	Nov. 16	Wabash	Cayuga	Putting coal in fire box, flue burst		1	
3693	Nov. 3	C.P.R.	Vancouver, Centre yard	Run over		1	
3694	Nov. 5	C.P.R.	Kingston yard	Struck by engine		1	
3695	Oct. 23	C.N.R.	Still Creek	Getting on train		1	
3698	Nov. 9	G.T.R.	Stratford, Ont	Coupling		1	
3699	Oct. 9	M.C.R.	Windsor, Ont	Adjusting coupler knuckle lock on track		1	
3700	Nov. 10	C.W. & L.E.	Bet. Chatham and Dover	Fell off top of car		1	
3701	Oct. 21	P.M.R.	Waterford	Lifting scoop after getting water		1	
3702	Oct. 22	G.T.R.	Tiffin, Ont	Taking water at crane pipe		1	
3703	Oct. 28	C.N.R.	North Battleford	Fell off top of car		1	
3705	Dec. 9	C.N.R.	Mile 8·6 Parry Sound, S.D.	Getting off car, got foot caught in grabiron		1	
3706	Nov. 31	C.P.R.	Shannonville	Train parted		2	
3708	Nov. 20	C.N.R.	Rosedale	Caught between running board on top of car		1	
3709	Dec. 1	C.N.R.	Camrose, Alta	Opening knuckle in car		1	
3710	Nov. 27	Wabash	Belle River, Ont	Putting in new water glass		1	
3711	Nov. 6	G.T.R.	Trenton, Ont	Struck by engine	1		
3712	Oct. 2	G.T.R.	Colborne, Ont	Fell off engine	1		
3713	Nov. 26	P.M.R.	St. Thomas Jct	Fell off engine	1		
3714	Nov. 22	M.C.R.	Montrose yard	Crushed between cars	1		
3715	Dec. 17	C.P.R.	Bordeaux	Struck by engine		1	
3717	Dec. 5	G.T.R.	Hamilton yard	Fell off car		1	
3719	Nov. 30	G.T.R.	Lakeside Station	Fell off train		1	
3720	Dec. 1	C.P.R.	Hochelaga	Struck by tender	1		
3724	Nov. 22	G.T.R.	St. Annes, Que	Jumped off train		1	
3726	Dec. 4	T.H. & B.	Hamilton, Aberdeen yard	Thrown from car	1		
3727	Nov. 24	C.N.R.	Rainy River	Fell off train		1	
3729	Nov. 20	C.P.R.	Hull	Fell on station platform		1	
3731	Nov. 18	C.P.R.	Hochelaga	Fell off top of car		1	
3732	Nov. 26	G.T.R.	Goderich, Ont	Bent arch tube		2	

No. 10—STATEMENT showing various other Accidents attended by Personal Injury Investigated during Year ending March 31, 1915—*Con.*

File.	Date.	Railway.	Place.	Remarks.	Killed.	Injured.
Inv.	1914.					
3734	Oct. 12	C.P.R.	Narreby	Coach passed over foot		1
3741	Nov. 28	G.T.R.	Forest, Ont.	Jumped off train		1
3744	Dec. 7	G.T.R.	North Parkdale, Ont.	Struck foot against rail		1
3745	Nov. 7	C.N.R.	Regina	Thrown from car, coupling		1
3746	Nov. 18	C.P.R.	Sutherland east mile board	Run over	1	
3748	Dec. 15	G.T.R.	London yard	Switching		3
3749	Dec. 21	E. & L.S.	Kingsville, Farham	Must have twisted live wire when on top of car	1	
3750	Nov. 26	N.Y.C. & H.R.	Russell, Ont.	Fell while climbing over top of car		1
3752	Dec. 16	G.T.R.	Coteau Junction, Que.	Pulling car out of siding, pole broke		1
3755	Dec. 15	C.P.R.	Crow Lake	Jumped off train	1	
3757	Dec. 24	C.N.R.	Melfort	Squirt hose working open		1
3471	June 20	O. & N.Y.	Cornwall, Ont.	Struck by motor		1
3763	Jan. 22	G.T.R.	Niagara Falls	Run over	1	
3764	Jan. 9	G.T.R.	Fort Erie	Adjusting couplers		1
3767	Dec. 23	C.N.R.	Dalmeny	Jumped off train		1
3768	Dec. 9	C.N.R.	Brandon Transfer track	Crushed between cars		1
3771	Jan. 16	C.N.R.	Zealandia, mile post 59	Steam pipe on injector breaking		1
3773	Nov. 21	C.P.R.	McAdam Junction	Trimming coal on tender		1
3775	Jan. 7	C.P.R.	Mileage 33-06, Benton, Woodstock.	Getting off train	1	
3777	Dec. 5	C.N.R.	Mil. 282, bet. Kamsack and Veregin.	Caught between engine and caboose		1
3778	Jan. 16	C.N.R.	Saskatoon, Sask.	Riding cars during coupling movements		1
3779	Jan. 4	G.T.R.	Montreal, Pt. St. Charles	Backing in on dump car track		1
3781	Jan. 13	G.T.R.	Brantford	Slipped off step alighting from train		1
3782	Jan. 25	G.T.R.	London yard	Adjusting couplers		1
3783	Nov. 18	M.F. & M.	Fernie yard	Switching	1	
3784	Nov. 24	C.P.R.	Cranbrook yard	Run over	1	
3785	Jan. 12	G.T.R.	Hamilton yard	Standing on footboard of engine		1
3787	Feb. 10	G.T.R.	Toronto	Run over	1	
3789	Feb. 12	G.T.R.	Thamesville	Struck by bridge	1	
3790	Feb. 6	G.T.R.	Mimico, Ont.	Struck by train	1	
3794	Feb. 20	G.T.R.	Ste. Annes	Struck by train	1	
3796	Dec. 20	C.P.R.	Field	Struck by engine	1	
3800	Nov. 8	G.T.P.	Nose Lake, B.C.	Run over	1	
3801	Feb. 16	C.N.O.	Brockville, Ont.	Caught between shed and platform of car		1
3802	Feb. 2	Wabash	Jarvis, Ont.	Ground under engine	1	
3803	Feb. 12	G.T.R.	Seaforth	Setting brakes on car		1
3808	Feb. 16	C.N.R.	Brazeau, mil. 152, 1½ poles west	Thrown against water tank		1

3809	Feb. 9	Q.M. & S...	Fortierville	Fell from tender of engine			1
3810	Feb. 7	G.T.R.	Coteau June	Fell off car		1	
3813	Feb. 8	C.P.R.	McLeod yard	Attempted to cross track in front of train			1
3814	Mar. 7	G.T.R.	Belleville, 2 miles east	Crown sheet scorched			1
3816	Feb. 3	G.T.R.	Stratford	Adjusting couplers			1
3817	Feb. 23	V.V. & E...	Vancouver Yard	Adjusting couplers			1
3818	Feb. 16	G.T.R.	Compton	Descending ladder from car			1
3819	Feb. 8	G.T.R.	Brockville, Manitoba yard	Caught between engine and cab and apron of coal chute			1
3820	Feb. 24	G.T.R.	London	Struck by car			1
3822	Mar. 2	M.C.R.	Ridgetown, 2 miles west	Fell off engine			1
3824	Feb. 22	M.C.R.	Windsor yard	Riding side of car			1
3826	Feb. 26	G.T.R.	Montreal, Turcot	Fell from top of car			1
3828	Mar. 6	G.T.R.	Actonvale	Fell from top of car			1
3830	Feb. 26	G.T.R.	Sarnia tunnel yard	Adjusting couplers			1
3831	Jan. 22	C.P.R.	Aurora, one mile east	Stepping from car to engine			1

Total number of investigations 268
Total killed 65
Total injured 233

No. 11.—Recapitulation of Accidents Investigated.

	Number of Investigations.	Killed.	Injured.
Statement number 7 showing collisions attended by personal injury investigated during the year ending March 31, 1915	49	19	165
Statement number 8 showing derailments attended by personal injury investigated during year ending March 31, 1915	34	11	81
Statement number 9 showing highway crossing accidents attended by personal injury investigated during year ending March 31, 1915	115	48	93
Statement number 10 showing various other accidents attended by personal injury investigated during year ending March 31, 1915	268	65	233
Total	466	143	572

No. 12.—Statement showing the Number of Highway Crossing Accidents by Provinces and Railways, Year ending March 31, 1915.

Name of Railway.	Ontario.	Quebec.	New Brunswick.	Nova Scotia.	Manitoba.	British Columbia.	Saskatchewan.	Alberta.	Yukon.	Total.	Killed.	Injured.
Canadian Pacific	21	9	1	...	1	....	2	2	....	36	15	25
Michigan Central	5	....	....	....	....	....	....	....	....	5	1	5
Grand Trunk	46	11	....	....	....	....	....	....	....	57	24	42
Canadian Northern	3	....	....	....	1	....	2	1	....	7	2	6
Canadian Northern Ontario	2	....	....	....	....	....	....	....	....	2	2	1
Père Marquette	2	....	....	....	....	....	....	....	....	2	....	2
St. Lawrence and Adirondack	....	1	....	....	....	....	....	....	....	1	....	1
Windsor, Essex & Lake Shore	2	....	....	....	....	....	....	....	....	2	....	4
Central Vermont	....	1	....	....	....	....	....	....	....	1	....	1
Halifax and South Western	....	....	....	1	....	....	....	....	....	1	....	1
Boston and Maine	....	1	....	....	....	....	....	....	....	1	2	....
Brantford and Hamilton Electric	1	....	....	....	....	....	....	....	....	1	1	2
Total	82	23	1	1	2	....	4	3	....	116	47	90

No. 13.—Statement showing Highway Crossings at which protection provided, and nature of protection, during year ending March 31, 1915.

File No.	Order No.	Location of Crossing.	Railway.	Nature of Protection.
9437-121	21711	Lachine, Eighteenth Avenue	G.T.R.	Gates.
23458	21724	Oak Lake, Manitoba, First Avenue	C.P.R.	Electric bell.
9437-1107	21757	Central Ontario Junction, crossing first public highway east	C.P.R.	Electric bell.
9437-1090	21815	Three Rivers, Laviolette Avenue	C.P.R.	Electric bell.
9437-1060	21836	Port Hammond, Municipality of Maple Ridge	C.P.R.	Electric bell.
9437-1095	21865	Allison, Ont., Albert Street	C.P.R.	Electric bell.
9437-1088 and 9437-1089	21866	Three Rivers, Quebec, St. Maurice Street	C.P.R.	Gates.
9437-1088 and 9437-1089	21866	Three Rivers, Quebec, St. Thomas Street	C.P.R.	Gates.
9437-1088 and 9437-1089	21866	Three Rivers, Quebec, Bonaventure Street	C.P.R.	Gates.
9437-1099	21878	Toronto, Cherry Street	C.P.R.	Flagman from 6.30 a.m. until 7 p.m.
9437-1129	21900	Fort William Station, highway crossing west	D.A.R.	Flagman for trains not stopping at station.
22282	21931	Twp. of Toronto, County Peel, Eurontario Street	C.P.R.	Subway.
22282	21913	Twp. of Ontario, County Peel, Dundas Street	C.P.R.	Gates.
9437-1105	21975	Armilla, Sask., crossing of public road just west	C.P.R.	Diversion of crossing into highway.
9437-1138	21978	London, Ont., crossing of main approach to hospital for insane	C.P.R.	Electric bell.
9437-1120	21979	Chatham, Ont., Head Street	Pere Marquette.	Electric bell and all train movements on siding to be flagged over crossing.
9437-485	22080	Wyoming, Ont., Main Street	G.T.R.	Gates to be operated between hours of 7 p.m. and 7 a.m. (formerly operated only during day hours).
9437-973	22083	New Westminster, B.C., Burnett Street	C.N.R. (V.V. & E.E. & N.).	Gates.
9437-987	22135	Public road leading from Cambridge, County Kings to Waterville, east of station	D.A.R.	Electric bell.
9437-1086	22147	St. Hubert, Que., crossing of highway	G.T.R.	Electric bell.
23420	22161	Edmonton, Alta., Syndicate Avenue	C.N. and G.T. Rys.	Gates.
23420	22161	Edmonton, Alta., Alberta Avenue	C.N. and G.T. Rys.	Gates.
3701-236	22214	Belleville, Ont., Kingston Road, 1 mile east	C.L.O. & W.Ry.	Electric bell
3701-38	22307	Parkham, Ont., crossing of Frontenac Road	C.L.O. & W.Ry.	Electric bell.
9437-1140	22386	Lot 16, Concession 9, Twp. Parry, Parry Sound District, Ont.	G.T.R.	Electric bell.
9437-1171	22406	St. Pauls Station crossing first public highway west	G.T.R.	Electric bell.
9437-1154	22458	Burlington Junction crossing 1½ miles east	G.T.R.	Electric bell
9437-1183	22520	Peterboro, Ont., Monaghan Road	G.T.R.	Electric bell.
9437-1189	22523	Ayers Cliff crossing ¾ mile south	B. & M.	Electric bell.
9437-1167	22659	Seaforth Station, Ont., just east	G.T.R.	Watchman 7 a.m. to 7 p.m
23253-1	22688	Niagara Falls, Ont., Bender Street	Michigan Cent'l	Train movements be flagged
9437-1146	22697	Simcoe, Ont., Norfolk Street	G.T.R.	Limitation of speed.

No. 13.—STATEMENT showing Highway Crossings at which protection provided, and nature of protection, during year ending March 31, 1915.—*Continued.*

File No.	Order No.	Location of Crossing.	Railway.	Nature of Protection.
9437·1178	22699	North Toronto, Ont., Maclennan Street	C.P.R.	Gates.
Case 1223	22710	Hamilton, Ont., Ottawa Street	G.T.R.	Gates.
3878·308	22760	Lot 53, Concession1, Twp. Sydney, Hastings County, Ont., crossing Kingston Road	C.N.O.R.	Gates.
9437·1192	22785	Crossing bet. lots 5 and 6, Twp. Toronto	C.P.R.	Electric bell.
16943	22792	Hamilton, Wentworth Street	G.T.R.	Switching movements be flagged.
9437·1187	22894	Uhthoff, short distance west of Tp. Orillia	G.T.R.	Electric bell.
12912·2	22896	Montreal, Park Avenue	C.P.R.	Gates.
21907	22905	Prince Albert, Sask., Fourth Avenue west	C.N.R.	Watchman, 6.30 a.m. to 6.30 p.m. daily except Sunday.
2100·42	22971	Mil. 60·09 bet. Concessions 9 and 10, Tp. Eldon	C.P.R.	Electric bell.
9437·1186	22986	Calgary, Twelfth Street East	C.P.R.	Watchman between hours 8 a.m. and 7 p.m.
9437·844	23030	Hamilton, Gage Avenue, formerly Trolley Street	G.T.R.	Gates.
9437·1143	23038	Duncan Station, B.C., south of	E. & N. Ry.	Electric bell.
9437·1221	23047	New Westminster, B.C., Front Street	C.N.R.	Electric bell.
20062	23074	Vancouver, B.C., Pender Street	V.V. & E.R. & N.	Trains to be flagged.
20062	23074	Vancouver, B.C., Keefer Street	V.V. & E.R. & N.	Trains to be flagged.
20062	23074	Vancouver, B.C., Harris Street	V.V. & E.R. & N.	Trains to be flagged.
9437·1225	23115	Meaford Station, Bridge Street	G.T.R.	Station or other employee to act as watchman during switching operations.
9437·1126	21594	Bridge Street, Niagara Falls, Ont.	G.T.R.	Train movements flagged.
9437·1102	21611	Moorefield, Ont., County Road No. 8	G.T.R.	Electric bell.
9437·170	23249	Oakville, highway immediately west station	G.T.R.	Electric bell.
9437·1157	23277	Casselman, Concession Street	G.T.R.	Electric bell.
9437·1157	23277	Casselman, Sealey Street	G.T.R.	Removal of section house.
22611	23278	Piapot, Sask., N.W.S. 7 T., 12 R., 25 W. of 3	C.P.R.	Electric bell.
9437·1211	23306	London, Ont., Dundas Street	G.T.R.	Limitation of speed.
9437·1166	23433	Main Road bet. Ketepec and Acamac, N.B.	C.P.R.	Electric bell
9437·1164	23413	Martinon Station	C.P.R.	Electric bell.
9437·1153	22206	Brampton, Ont., James Street	G.T.R.	Electric bell.
9437·1147	22188	Berlin, Ont., Wilmot Street	G.T.R.	Electric bell.
23753	22957	Tp. of Barton, County Wentworth, Kennilworth Avenue (Hamilton)	St. Ry., G.T.R.	Subway.
660·71	21788	Mun. Strathclair, Man., roadway between sections 5 and 8, Tp. 18, R. 21, W. 1 M. and section 6, Tp. 18, R. 21	C.N.R.	Diversion.
22512·1	21904	Between lots 5 and 6, Con. 5, W. of Tp. of Toronto, Peel County	C.P.R.	Subway.
23757	26450	Simcoe, Union Street	G.T.R.	Switching movements flagged.
9437·1176	23455	Union School crossing between Tps. Stisted and Stephenson	G.T.R.	Removal of trees.

RECAPITULATION.

Removal of trees	1
Gates	14
Electric bell	29
Flagman	6
Subway	3
Diversion	2
Limitation of speed	2
Removal of buildings	1
Train movements flagged	7
Total	65

No. 14.—STATEMENT showing the number of Highway Crossings at which protection has been ordered by the Board, and nature of protection, set out by provinces and separately, for the years ending March 31, 1913, 1914, and 1915.

Nature of Protection.	Nova Scotia.			New Brunswick			Quebec.			Ontario.			Manitoba.			Saskatchewan.			Alberta.			British Columbia.			Total.			Grand Total 1913, 1914, 1915.
	1913	1914	1915	1913	1914	1915	1913	1914	1915	1913	1914	1915	1913	1914	1915	1913	1914	1915	1913	1914	1915	1913	1914	1915	1913	1914	1915	
Gates	1			2			2	3	5	15	16	6	1	3						3	2	1		1	22	25	14	61
Electric bell	6		1	1		2	3	3	3	30	37	18			1		1	1	1	1	3		2		41	44	29	114
Watchman			1					2		8	5	3	2	1		1	4	1			1	1			12	12	6	30
Subway										1	2	3				1				1			1		2	4	3	9
Diversion										2								2							2		2	4
Limitation of speed											4	2		3												7	2	9
Removal of buildings							1					1													1		1	2
Train movements flagged								1			3	4												3		4	7	11
Tracks to be kept clear										1	1														1	1		2
Removal of tracks																1	1								1	1		2
Removal of banks and trees										3	1	1													3	1	1	5
Overhead bridge										2															2			2
Total	7		2	3		2	6	9	8	62	69	38	3	7	1	3	6	4	1	5	6	2	3	4	87	99	65	251

No. 15.—Statement showing the totals by Provinces and Railways as regards "Trespassers" killed, and injured during the year ending March 31, 1915.

Name of Railway.	Ontario.		Quebec.		British Columbia.		Alberta.		Saskatchewan.		Manitoba.		New Brunswick		Total.	
	K.	I.	K.	I.	K.	I.	K.	I.	K.	I.	K.	I.	K.	I.	K.	I.
Canadian Pacific	26	19	10	6	15	8	6	5	7	1	8	4		1	72	44
Grand Trunk	51	33	20	10											71	43
Canadian Northern	2	2					2	1		6	2	4			6	13
Grand Trunk Pacific						2		2			2	1			2	5
Toronto, Hamilton and Buffalo	3	3													3	3
Canadian Northern Quebec			5	2											5	2
Pere Marquette	1	4													1	4
Michigan Central	3	2													3	2
Esquimalt and Nanaimo			1		1	2									1	2
Boston and Maine															1	
Algoma Central and Hudson Bay	1														1	
Ottawa and New York		1														1
Wabash		1														1
Canadian Northern Ontario	3	4													3	4
St. Lawrence and Adirondack			1	1											1	1
Central Vermont				1												1
Total	90	69	37	20	16	12	8	8	7	7	12	9		1	170	126

No. 16.—STATEMENT showing the Number of Persons Killed and Injured on the various railways in Canada, under the jurisdiction of the Board, from February 1, 1904, until March 31, 1915, classified and shown separately for each and every year.

Year.	Passengers.		Employees.		Others.		Total.	
	K.	I.	K.	I.	K.	I	K.	I.
1905	73	38	168	92	161	14	402	144
1906	76	43	126	163	179	17	381	223
1907	42	210	212	317	206	76	460	603
1908	64	326	246	806	219	177	529	1,309
1909	26	227	191	769	231	205	448	1,201
1910	51	211	194	745	211	167	456	1,123
1911	24	132	263	788	207	199	494	1,119
1912	28	292	230	1,381	231	238	489	1,911
1913	21	110	303	1,603	319	218	643	2,231
1914	31	339	249	1,250	314	310	594	1,899
1915	8	239	99	873	230	251	337	1,363
Totals	441	2,467	2,281	8,787	2,598	1,872	5,233	13,126

No. 17.—STATEMENT showing the Number of Persons Killed and Injured in the More Prominent Accidents on the various railways under the jurisdiction of the Board, shown separately for each year for the five years ending March 31, 1915.

Nature of Accident.	1911.		1912.		1913.		1914.		1915.		Total.	
	K.	I.	K.	I.	K.	I.	K.	I.	K.	I	K.	I.
Derailment	9	66	45	221	19	317	39	257	7	82	119	943
Collision, head on	21	30	8	58	26	108	7	29	2	46	64	271
Collision, rear end	7	33	13	31	16	90	14	23	7	49	57	226
Collision, in yard	*	*	*	*	8	51	18	55	3	54	29	160
Collision with cars, foul main track	..	4	5	7	2	1	..	8	..	2	7	22
Collision with cars, open switch	1	4	2	39	..	15	5	17	..	4	8	79
Collision at level crossing	1	11	2	4	..	..	1	39	2	22	6	76
Highway crossing, protected	*	*	13	26	10	14	17	31	10	22	50	93
Highway crossing, unprotected	*	*	36	53	29	48	44	84	37	68	146	253
Highway crossing	†37	†64	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	37	64
Trespassing	146	69	162	122	251	116	228	164	170	126	967	597
Adjusting couplers, coupling, etc	10	63	11	63	29	92	11	60	7	38	68	316
Hand car, motor, etc., struck by train	9	9	13	10	16	16	10	13	5	9	53	57
Struck by switch stand, water spout, etc.	..	9	2	22	1	21	4	21	1	8	8	81
Caught between cars and buildings	*	*	..	13	7	9	4	7	..	9	11	38
Falling off passenger trains	3	9	7	15	10	13	6	17	3	11	29	65
Falling off top of car, walking over train	10	44	2	29	10	43	4	41	4	22	30	179
Falling between cars, walking over train	1	6	2	3	2	7	2	5	2	3	9	24
Getting off train in motion	33	30	8	43	12	53	7	55	3	45	63	226
Attempt to board train in motion	24	38	4	26	16	40	8	47	2	29	54	180
Run down by engine or cars	*	*	*	*	55	64	56	64	33	41	144	169
Locomotive dropping crown sheet of fire box	..	2	1	3	1	10	2	4	..	3	4	22
Total	312	491	336	788	520	1,128	497	1,041	298	693	1,963	4,141

NOTE.—*Heading not in existence.
†No distinction made up to this time between protected and unprotected crossings.

No. 18.—STATEMENT of Terminal Tests of Air Brakes in Trains, in connection with Clause 1 of General Order No. 65, for year ending March 31, 1915.

Name of Railway.	Number of trains.	Number of cars.	Number of air cars.	Number of non-air brakes.	Number of brakes cut out.	Brakes that did not apply.	Brakes that operated.	Cars not controlled by air.	Cars controlled by air.	Per cent of case controlled by air.	Brakes with excessive piston travel.
Canadian Pacific	20	736	736	.....	15	33	690	48	690	93·50	34
Grand Trunk	16	552	552	.....	15	39	498	54	498	90·22	27
Canadian Northern	2	96	96	.....	7	.....	89	7	89	92·70	5
Canadian Northern Quebec	1	16	16	.....	.....	1	15	1	15	93·75	1
Boston and Maine	1	7	7	.....	1	.....	6	1	6	85·71	...
Quebec, Montreal and Southern	1	16	16	.....	.....	3	13	3	13	81·25	...
Pere Marquette	1	47	47	.....	4	4	39	8	39	82·97	
New York Central	1	19	19	.....	.....	1	18	1	18	94·74	1
Total	43	1,491	1,491	.....	42	81	1,368	123	1,368	91·75	68

No. 19.—Statement Showing Cars Inspected for Year ending March 31, 1915, together with Defects Noted.

Name of Railway.	Cars inspected.	Cars defective.	Per cent defective.	Grand total defects.	Couplers and parts.	Per cent defective.	Uncoupling mechanism	Per cent defective.		Per cent defective.	Air brakes.	Per cent defective.
Grand Trunk	35,324	2,038	5·74	2,120	84	3·96	333	15·71	25	1·09	1,245	58·72
Canadian Pacific	56,066	3,420	6·10	3,628	68	1·04	377	10·40	25	2·34	2,304	63·50
Canadian Northern	4,599	460	10·02	548	8	1·45	89	16·24	53	5·83	239	42·61
Canadian Northern Quebec	4,630	296	6·39	302	4	1·32	45	14·90			176	58·28
Grand Trunk Pacific	1,796	135	7·51	141	1	0·71	18	12·76	24	17·02	53	37·58
Pere Marquette	1,080	84	7·77	100			9	9·00	1	1·00	84	84·00
Toronto, Hamilton & Buffalo	460	13	2·82	15					1	6·66	8	53·33
Quebec, Montreal and Southern	280	23	8·21	25	1	4·00	2	8·00			15	60·00
Central Vermont	389	27	6·94	29			4	13·79			17	58·62
Boston and Maine	645	42	6·51	44			1	2·27			29	65·90
Dominion Atlantic	55	6	10·90	6							5	83·33
Great Northern	23	1	4·34	1								
Victoria and Sydney	29	18	62·06	31			6	19·35	10	32·25	4	12·90
Algoma Central and Hudson Bay	110	15	13·63	19			2	10·52	6	31·57	2	10·52
Total	105,486	6,578	6·24	7,009	166	2·36	886	12·64	182	2·59	4,181	59·63

No. 19.—Statement Showing Cars Inspected for Year ending March 31, 1915, together with Defects Noted.

Name of Railway.	Ladders.	Per cent defective.	Sill steps.	Per cent defective.	Height of couplers.	Per cent defective.	Miscellaneous.	Per cent defective.
Grand Trunk	53	2·50	43	1·50			339	15·99
Canadian Pacific	260	7·11	156	4·30			378	10·42
Canadian Northern	30	5·47	68	12·40			82	14·96
Canadian Northern Quebec	55	18·21	11	3·64			11	3·64
Grand Trunk Pacific	6	4·25	11	7·80			28	19·85
Père Marquette							6	6·00
Toronto, Hamilton and Buffalo	2	13·33	2	13·33			2	13·33
Quebec, Montreal and Southern	3	12·00					4	16·00
Central Vermont			1	3·44			7	24·13
Boston and Maine	1	2·27					13	29·54
Dominion Atlantic							1	16·66
Great Northern			1	100·00				
Victoria and Sydney	2	6·45	5	16·13			4	12·92
Algoma Central and Hudson Bay	5	26·31	3	15·78			1	5·26
Total	417	5·95	301	4·29			876	12·50

No. 20.—Defective Appliances on Freight Cars, reported by Inspectors, for Year ending March 31, 1915.

Couplers and Parts.

Coupler body broken	7
Coupler body worn	
Guard arm short	
Knuckle broken	3
Knuckle worn	
Knuckle missing	8
Knuckle pin broken	1
Knuckle pin wrong	
Knuckle pin bent	2
Knuckle pin missing	1
Lock block broken	125
Lock block worn	
Lock block wrong	
Lock block bent	
Lock block inoperative	3
Lock block missing	14
Lock block key missing	2
Lock block trigger missing	
Total	166

Uncoupling Mechanism.

Uncoupling lever broken	140
Uncoupling lever wrong	2
Uncoupling lever bent	37
Uncoupling lever incorrectly applied	
Uncoupling lever missing	81
Uncoupling chain broken	593
Uncoupling chain too long	11
Uncoupling chain too short	9
Uncoupling chain kinked	
Uncoupling chain missing	10
End casting broken	
End casting wrong	
End casting bent	
End casting loose	
End casting incorrectly applied	
End casting missing	
Keeper broken	
Keeper wrong	
Keeper bent	
Keeper loose	1
Keeper incorrectly applied	
Keeper missing	2
Angle clip loose	
Total	886

Hand Holds.

Hand hold broken	5
Hand hold bent	102
Hand hold loose	10
Hand hold incorrectly applied	4
Hand hold missing	61
Total	182

Miscellaneous	876

No. 20.—Defective Appliances on Freight Cars, reported by Inspectors, for Year ending March 31, 1915—*Concluded.*

Air Brakes.

Triple valve defective	
Triple valve missing	
Reservoir defective	
Reservoir loose	
Cylinder defective	6
Cylinder loose	78
Cylinder and triple valve not cleaned within 13 months	277
Cylinder and triple valve not stencilled, with date of cleaning	2
Cut out cock and defective	128
Release cock defective	1
Release cock missing	
Release rod broken	129
Release rod missing	375
Angle cock defective	316
Angle cock missing	17
Train pipe broken	19
Train pipe loose	124
Train pipe bracket missing	1
Cross over pipe defective	18
Hose defective	12
Hose missing	161
Hose gasket missing	
Retaining valve defective	166
Retaining valve missing	7
Retaining pipe defective	294
Retaining pipe missing	3
Brake rigging defective	
Brake cut out	2,042
Brake cut out; card old	
No brakes of any kind	5
Pump missing	
Total	4,161

Ladders.

Ladder round broken	28
Ladder round bent	100
Ladder round loose	255
Ladder round missing	19
Ladder incorrectly applied	
Ladder loose	15
Total	417

Sill Steps.

Sill step broken	7
Sill step bent	226
Sill step loose	19
Sill step incorrectly applied	
Sill step missing	49
Total	301

Height of Couplers.

Coupler too high	
Coupler too low	
Carrier iron loose	
Total	
Grand Total	7,009

No. 21 (*a*).—Comparative Statement of Defects on Freight Cars between the Years ending March 31, 1913, 1914, and 1915.

	1913.	1914.	1915.
Couplers and parts	493	336	166
Uncoupling mechanism	2,632	1,606	886
Handholds	560	241	182
Air brakes	2,946	5,935	4)181
Ladders	801	647	417
Sill steps	613	485	301
Height of couplers	31	21	
Miscellaneous	1,110	1,511	876
Grand total	14,186	10,782	7,009

No. 21 (*b*).—Comparative Statement of Cars inspected and defective between the years ending March 31, 1913, 1914 and 1915.

	1913.	1914.	1915.
Cars inspected	137,034	110,407	105,486
Cars defective	13,110	9,989	6,578
Percentage defective	9·56%	9·05%	6·24%

No. 22.—STATEMENT showing Station Locations approved of during Year ending March 31, 1915.

Name of Station.	Province.	Railway.	Date.	Order Number.	File Number.
Admirals Road	British Columbia	E. & N.	Feb. 19	23214	23355
Aubrey	Quebec	G.T.R.	July 8	22194	24615
Avonhurst	Saskatchewan	G.T.P.	June 9	21960	24354
Alsask	Saskatchewan	C.N.R.	June 18	22020	24225
Athalmer	British Columbia	C.P.R.	July 14	22207	1136·13
Aleza Lake	British Columbia	G.T.P.	Oct. 23	22744	1242·1
Anorley	Saskatchewan	C.N.R.	Feb. 23	23335	25582
Birch Point	Ontario	C.P.R.	April 11	21633	24197
Bridge End	Ontario	G. & S. (C.P.R.)	Oct. 19	22730	24881
Burns Lake	British Columbia	G.T.P.	Oct. 20	22733	3452·54
Bednisti	British Columbia	G.T.P.	Oct. 27	22769	24860
Borlon	Alberta	C.N.R.	Jan. 15, 1915	23173	25410
Billy	Alberta	C.N.R.	Feb. 15	23295	25420
Clemow	Ontario	C.N.O.	May 27	21886	24372
Craigmyle	Alberta	C.N.R.	June 30	22101	24291
Coquitlam	British Columbia	C.P.R.	July 29	22289	20750
Craig	British Columbia	E. & N.	Sept. 11	22535	24570
Clanston	Saskatchewan	C.N.R.	Sept. 16	22558	24590
Cornwall	Ontario	G. & S.	Oct. 25	22774	22902·7
Chip Lake	Alberta	C.N.R.	Jan. 15, 1915	23173	25412
Calahao	Alberta	C.N.R.	Jan. 15	23173	25419
Carrat	Alberta	C.N.R.	Feb. 9	23264	25415
Duncannon	British Columbia	G.T.P.	June 24	22054	24280
Dulhuth	Ontario	G.T.R.	July 13	22197	24623
Dashwood	British Columbia	E. & N.	Sept. 23	22599	24920
Dewey	British Columbia	G.T.P.	Oct. 27	22767	24965
Dunnville	Ontario	Erie & Ont.	Nov. 3	22806	24560·35
Decher Lake	British Columbia	G.T.P.	Nov. 12	22857	24918
Donnenny	Saskatchewan	G.T.P.	Dec. 7	22969	24873
Diltz Junction	Ontario	E. & O.	Dec. 31	23068	24560·38
Dayman	Alberta	C.N.R.	Jan. 15, 1915	23173	25414
Dinsmore	Saskatchewan	C.N.R.	Jan. 30	23226	25501
Edgewater	British Columbia	C.P.R.	July 4	22137	1136·45
Eastend	Saskatchewan	C.P.R.	July 21	22239	24546
Evelyn	British Columbia	G.T.P.	Aug. 24	22435	24716
Eliose	Saskatchewan	C.N.R.	June 29	22077	24555
Engen	British Columbia	G.T.P.	Oct. 27	22769	24854
Eganville	Ontario	C.P.R.	Oct. 28	22778	11403
Entwistle	Alberta	C.N.R.	Feb. 9	23269	25085
Foreman	British Columbia	G.T.P.	Oct. 23	22744	1274·0
Forest Dale	British Columbia	G.T.P.	Nov. 12	22857	14947
Fulstow	Alberta	C.N.R.	Jan. 15, 1915	23173	25413
Fargan	Saskatchewan	C.N.R.	Mar. 16	23429	25669
Glenbrook	Ontario	G. & S. (C.P.R.)	Sept. 26	22618	24880
Glenmorris	Ontario	L.E. & N. (C.P.R.)	Oct. 16	22719	24929
Glengordon	Ontario	G. & S. (C.P.R.)	Oct. 19	22730	24883
Giscome	British Columbia	G.T.P.	Oct. 27	22767	24969
Galt	Ontario	L. E. & N.	Nov. 6	22833	10834·76
Glasnevin	Saskatchewan	C.P.R.	Jan. 18, 1915	23172	24604
Genona	Saskatchewan	G.T.P.	Feb. 15	23297	25103
Hubert	British Columbia	G.T.P.	June 23	22049	24455
Hughton	Saskatchewan	C.N.R.	Sept. 3	22507	23717
Hulatt	British Columbia	G.T.P.	Oct. 27	22769	24859
Hansars	British Columbia	G.T.P.	Nov. 30	22942	25010
Hutton	British Columbia	G.T.P.	Dec. 24	23048	24971
Henry House	Alberta	C.N.R.	Feb. 24	23350	25567
Inglewood	Ontario	G.T.R.	Dec. 17	23012	25284
Krensburg	Manitoba	C.P.R.	May 16	21839	23426
Kaslo	British Columbia	C.P.R.	Dec. 17	22997	25051
Lac a Travers	Ontario	C.N.O.	April 11	21632	24143
Lac aux Sables	Quebec	C.N.Q.	May 6	21764	24117
Larchwood	Ontario	C.P.R.	May 12	21795	24314
Lorlie	Saskatchewan	G.T.P.	June 12	21983	24353

No. 22.—STATEMENT showing Station Locations approved of during Year ending March 31, 1915—*Concluded.*

Name of Station.	Province.	Railway.	Date.	Order Number.	File Number.
Lawson	Saskatchewan	G.T.P	July 2	22118	24118
Lacolle	Quebec	G.T.R	July 13	22197	24627
Lancaster	Ontario	G. & S. R	Sept. 29	22623	24882
Luxar	British Columbia	Kootenay (C.P.R.)	Oct. 17	22716	1138-44
Longworth	British Columbia	G.T.P	Oct. 27	22767	24968
Lindup	British Columbia	G.T.P	Oct. 27	22767	24970
Lobstick	Alberta	C.N.R	Jan. 15, 1915	23173	25417
Mount Geihie	Alberta	C.N.R	Feb. 23	23339	25571
Mervin	Saskatchewan	C.N.R	May 27	21895	24403
Mountain Park	Alberta	G.T.P	July 2	22104	22638
Mile 758·0	Alberta	G.T.P	July 3	22120	19275
Marten Lake	British Columbia	G.T.P	Sept. 15	22556	24717
Musk	Ontario	C.P.R	Sept. 27	22631	24787
Miworth	British Columbia	G.T.P	Oct. 27	22769	24861
Marlboro	Alberta	C.N.R	Mar. 12	23405	25650
McCall	British Columbia	G.T.P	Oct. 27	22769	24856
National Park	District Nipissing	C.N.O	April 8	21624	21544
North Bay	Ontario	C.N.O			
Nowlands	British Columbia	G.T.P	Oct. 27	22767	24966
Nichol	British Columbia	G.T.P	Dec. 7	22972	24857
New Westminster	British Columbia	C.N.R	Dec. 14	23016	12055
Otway	British Columbia	G.T.P	Oct. 27	22769	24855
Obed	Alberta	C.N.R	Feb. 23	23338	25565
Penetanguishene	Ontario	G.T.R	May 16	21852	24363
Pays Plat	Ontario	C.P.R	Sept. 22	22589	24715
Paris	Ontario	L. & E.N	Nov. 5	22823	24911
Priestly	British Columbia	G.T.P	Nov. 12	22857	3452-106
Palling	British Columbia	G.T.P	Nov. 12	22859	24945
Palmer	British Columbia	B. & N	Nov. 28	22944	23838
Port Davidson	Ontario	E. & O	Jan. 8, 1915	23108	24560-39
Quick	British Columbia	G.T.P	Nov. 12	22857	24987
Ringold	Ontario	C.P.R	May 14	21803	24179
Royston	British Columbia	B. & N	Sept. 29	22628	24939
Rose Lake	British Columbia	G.T.P	Nov. 12	22857	24946
Robsart	Saskatchewan	C.P.R	Mar. 3	23372	25495
Spillimacheen	British Columbia	C.P.R	April 2	21582	23528
St. Christopher	Ontario	C.P.R	April 30	21715	24212
St. Darathel	Quebec	C.N.O	June 9	21965	2342-108
St. Polycarpe	Quebec	G.T.R	July 13	22197	24622
Savory	British Columbia	G.P.T	Oct. 21	22734	24908
Shelley	British Columbia	G.T.P	Oct. 27	22767	24972
Sheraton	British Columbia	G.T.P	Oct. 29	22769	24858
St. Liboire	Quebec	G.T.R	Nov. 19	22879	24889
Scriven	Alberta	C.N.R	Feb. 23	23340	25569
Tintagel	British Columbia	G.T.P	Oct. 29	22769	24863
Turtleford	Saskatchewan	C.N.R	Dec. 28	23052	24734
Tollerton	Alberta	G.N.R	Mar. 16	23428	25670
Vaughan	Ontario	E. & O	Jan. 8, 1915	23107	24560-37
Vaughan	Ontario	C.N.O	June 22	22033	24371
Wilkinson	Ontario	C.P.R	April 7	21608	3701-365
Waterville	Quebec	G.T.R	Oct. 28	22775	24888
Walcott	British Columbia	G.T.P	Nov. 12	22857	24986
Wiseton	Saskatchewan	C.N.R	Jan. 13	23135	25405

Total number of locations approved—116.

SESSIONAL PAPER No. 20c

No. 23.—STATEMENT showing Complaints and Applications Referred to the Operating Department for Report. Year ending March 31, 1915.

File Number.	Particulars.
24225	Complaint *re* train service on C.P.R. to and from Alsask, Saskatchewan.
24302	Complaint *re* train service on C.P.R. between Winnipeg and Lac Du Bonnet, Manitoba.
24322	Complaint *re* lack of proper fencing and trespassing on C.P.R in the city of Toronto.
24325	Application for an agent at Arran, Sask., on Canadian Northern Railway.
9994·155	Complaint *re* condition of fencing on G.T.R. in vicinity of Argyle, Ontario.
G–2245	Complaint *re* reduction in train service on C.P.R. Lyleton Subdivision.
23938	Complaint *re* train service on the line of the Irondale and Bancroft Railway.
24547	Complaint *re* crossings in township of Amaranth on Canadian Pacific Railway.
9437·1176	Complaint *re* dangerous crossing between Nepedia and Huntsville, Grand Trunk Railway.
G–2369	Complaint *re* C.P.R. operating wooden postal car in an all-steel train.
965·25	Application Municipality of Abernethy Number 186 for a crossing on C.P.R. between sections 22 and 23–21–12 W. 2 M. west of Balcarres, Sask.
22506	Complaint *re* accommodation and facilities for freight at Alcona, Ontario, G.T.P.
25240	Complaint *re* reduction in train service on Stratford division of the Grand Trunk.
4205·33	Application of C.P.R. to remove its agent at Appin, Ontario.
3701·150	Complaint *re* private crossing on C.L.O. & W. in the vicinity of Newcastle, Ontario.
25515	Application for a station agent at Aiktow, Sask., C.P.R.
25720	Complaint *re* change in train service on Thunder Hill Branch, C.N.R.
25044	Application to have Halifax and South Western Railway re-open station at Argyle, N.S.
25721	Complaint *re* reduction in train service, Biggar-Battleford Branch, G.T.P.
4205·56	Complaint *re* removal of agent Brookfield Mines, N.S., H. & S.W. Railway.
4205·46	Application of C.P.R. to close its station at Bethany as a regular agency.
2100·97	Application of the C.P.R. to remove its agent from Brockin Station, Ontario.
25426	Complaint *re* C.P.R. removing sideboards from cars in gravel service.
24432	Application of C.N.R. to close Banning Station, as a regular agency.
23802	Complaint *re* closing of Beverly Station, Sask., C.P.R.
25344	Complaint *re* train service between Brandon and Winnipeg as regards connections from south of Brandon, C.P.R.
25751	Complaint *re* train service on G.T.P., Biggar-Loverna Branch.
25302	Complaint *re* condition of certain engines on C.P.R.
25325	Complaint *re* train service to and from Bobcaygeon on C.P.R.
15958·9	Complaint *re* delay to shipment of hogs from Wilcox and Milestone, on C.P.R.
4205·23	Application of C.N.R. to close its station at Beaver, Manitoba, as a regular agency.
4205·24	Application of C.N.R. to remove its agent from Barton Station, Manitoba.
G–2477	Complaint *re* connection at Brockville between C.N.R. and G.T.R.
25052	Complaint *re* facilities at Bois Blanc Station, C.N.R.
25107	Application of C.P.R. to close Bonheur Station as a regular agency.
24963	Application for an agent at Bender Hamlet, C.N.R.
3878·578	Complaint *re* condition of farm crossing, Lot 3, Concession Montague, C.N.R.
24851	Application for a farm crossing, Lot 9, Con. 3, vicinity of Chelmsford, C.P.R
24850	Application for a farm crossing, west half of Lot 8, Con. 3, vicinity of Chelmsford, C.P.R.
24823	Complaint *re* facilities Bar River, Ontario, C.P.R.
6695	Application for team track facilities, Barwick, Ont., C.N.R.
24914	Complaint *re* Grand Trunk discontinuing stopping train No. 28, Baden, Ont.
24348	Complaint *re* matters affecting the safe operation of trains in the vicinity of Edmonton, C.P.R.
342·3	Application for loading siding between Dauphin and Ashville on C.N.R..
18030	Application to have G.T.P. and C.N.R. use jointly the terminals of C.N.R. in Brandon.
G–2241	Complaint *re* fencing and cattle guards in vicinity of Berford, Ont., on G.T.R.
19801·74	Complaint *re* refusal of Pere Marquette to accept shipment of hogs for Buffalo from Amherstburg.
Case 4684	Complaint *re* Dominion Power and Transmission Company, building fence between right of way and public highway in the vicinity of Burlington.
24563	Application for a stock yard, Blackfoot, Alberta, C.P.R.
24479	Application to have C.P.R. trains numbers 61 and 62 stop at Belle Plains and Pense, Sask.
9437·763	Complaint *re* crossing Cote de Neiges Road over C.P.R. tracks, Montreal, Que.
G–2759	Complaint *re* late arrival of C.N.R. mixed train number 32 at Ottawa, Ont.
3701·286	Application for protection Ontario Street, Cobourg, Ont., G.T.R. and C.P.R.
25785	Complain *re* main service and lack of agent at Cordova, Sask., C.N.R.
25494	Complaint *re* train service on C.N.R., Camden East and Newburg.
25625	Application for an agent, Cote Double, near St. Placide, Que., C.N.R.
25717	Complaint *re* handling of westbound freight for Coblens, Sask., G.T.P.
25598	Application from n number of residents for removal of station from Hazel to Craig Siding, G.T.P
4205·51	Complaint *re* removal of agent, Camden, Ont., C.N.R.
18705·71	Complaint *re* delay in dispatching and placing of cars, Clyde Forks, Ont., C.P.R.
25486	Complaint *re* reduction in train service Halifax and South Western Railway and removal of agents at several stations.
25502	Complaint *re* reduction in train service, Crows Nest Branch, C.P.R.

No. 23.—STATEMENT showing Complaints and Applications Referred to the Operating Department for Report, Year ending March 31, 1915—*Continued.*

File Number.	Particulars.
4206-47	Application of C.P.R. to close its station at Clarendon, Ont., as a regular agency.
10823	Application of C.N.O. for interchange with C.P.R. at Chaudiere Junction.
25234	Application of C.P.R. to be relieved from complying with section 27o, Eastern Division.
25437	Application of C.P.R. to be relieved from complying with section 276, Atlantic Division.
25435	Application of C.P.R. to be relieved from complying with section 276, Ontario Division.
17751	Application for better station accommodation at Chelmsford, Ont., C.P.R.
25382	Application for use Morel Siding, C.P.R., for loading pulpwood.
25392	Complaint *re* Grand Trunk to supply 40 foot bars for 40 foot equipment.
4205-32	Application of C.P.R. to close its station at Chelsea as a regular agency.
25348	Complaint *re* train service on Edmonton-Athabaska extension, C.N.R.
12679	Application of C.P.R. to operate over interlocking plant Mileage 4, Mission Subdivision.
9437-1207	Application for gates at intersection of Quebec and Lake St. John Railway with Main Street, Chicoutimi, Que.
25136	Complaint *re* shunting nuisance in the town of Chicoutimi, Quebec and Lake St. John Railway.
25137	Complaint *re* station accommodation in the town of Chicoutimi, Quebec and Lake St. John Railway.
25328	Application of station facilities, Central Butte, Sask., G.T.P. Ry.
4205-10	Application of C.P.R. to close its station at Clan William as a regular agency.
23224	Application of C.N.R. to close its station at Chandler, Sask., as a regular agency.
G-2486	Inspection of crossing approaching Grand Trunk station over C.P.R. track, Cobourg, Ont.
660-75	Application for farm crossing in the vicinity of Clan William, C.N.R.
25202	Complaint *re* train service to and from Cumberland, C.N.O.
9437-1186	Inspection Twelfth Street east crossing, Calgary, Alta., C.P.R.
24962	Complaint re cancellation of a train on New York Central, Chateauguay, Que.
G-2402	Inquiry into accident between Grand Trunk and Pere Marquette, Chatham, Ont.
G-2380	Condition of G.T.R. Car No. 330 running out of Hamilton.
9437-1157	Application for protection, Concession Street, Casselman, G.T.R.
9437-1158	Application for protection, Second Street, Casselman, G.T.R.
24619	Application for improved station facilities at Casselman, G.T.R.
24549	Application for flag station between Creston and Duck Creek, B.C., C.P.R.
9437-133	Complaint *re* dangerous condition of first crossing west of M.C.R. station, Comber, Ont.
24474	Complaint *re* refusal of A.Q. & W. Ry. to construct a siding at Chandler, Que.
24275	Petition to have C.P.R. train stop at Christie's Crossing, Asphodel County.
4214-126	Inquiry *re* delivery limits of Express Company, Calgary, Alta.
9994-145	Complaint *re* fencing and cattle guards along Columbia River, C.P.R.
25662	Application for a siding in the vicinity of Denholm, on C.N.R., Prince Albert Branch.
25749	Application for a siding between Dalmeny and Mennon, C.N.R.
15328	Application of C.P.R. to remove its agent from Devlin, Ont.
23764	Application of C.N.R. to remove its agent from Delmas Station.
22412	Application to remove its agents from D'Arcy, Sask., C.N.R.
25065	Complaint *re* train service out of Deseronto, C.N.O.
3565-5	Complaint *re* train service beteeen Dalmeny and Laird, C.N.R.
24326	Application for station agent at Dunlop, Ont., C.P.R.
23725	Complaint *re* fares charged by Grand Trunk and C.N.R. between Depot Harbor and Parry Sound.
22754	Complaint *re* refusal of C.P.R. to construct a spur to serve brick yard in the vicinity of Dryden, Ont.
342-3	Application for a siding between Dauphin and Ashville, C.N.R.
20921	Application of G.T.P. to remove diamond at intersection Interurban Railway, 27th Street, Edmonton.
G-2689	Emergency tools in C.V.R. passenger trains running between Montreal and Waterloo.
4205-58	Application of G.T.P. to remove its agent from Eli, Man.
25562	Complaint *re* train service to and from Empress, C.P.R.
18903-82	Complaint *re* location of station site at Eunice, Alta., E.D. & B.C. Ry.
18903-76	Application for opening of traffic for a distance of 261·7 miles from Edmonton, E.D. & B.C. Ry
25119	Complaint *re* closing of station at Ensign, Alta.
24573	Complaint re location of station at Ethelbert, Alta., C.N.R.
21156	Application to carry Kinisto Avenue, Edmonton, under tracks of G.T.P. and C.N.R.
4205-40	Application of C.P.R. to remove its agent from Flower Station, Ont.
25404	Complaint *re* cancellation of 8 p.m. train from St. Jerome to Montreal, C.P.R.
4205-29	Application of C.N.R. to remove its agent from its station at Fairfax, Man.
18970	*Re* station Facilities at Fort Fraser, B.C., G.T.P.
25320	Complaint *re* discontinuance of C.N.R. trains Nos. 21 and 22 between Fort Francis and Winnipeg.
25049	Complaint *re* condition of roadway to elevator and team tracks, Crossfield, Alta., C.P.R.
1519-34	*Re* protection at Syndicate Avenue, Fort William, G.T.P.

SESSIONAL PAPER No. 20c

No. 23.—STATEMENT showing Complaints and Applications Referred to the Operating Department for Report, Year ending March 31, 1915—*Continued.*

File Number.	Particulars.
21826·1	*Re* temporary crossing over C.N.R. tracks leading from highway to Government Electro, Fort William.
G–2443	*Re* rough handling of C.P.R. train No. 15, Fredericton, Junction.
6715·73	*Re* transfer tracks between G.T.P. and C.P.R., Frobisher, Sask.
24959	Application for a flag station at Forfar crossing, C.N.R.
24808	Application for a local freight shed on the line of the C.P.R. at Fort William.
22435	Complaint *re* condition of Empire Avenue, Fort William, G.T.P.
22680	*Re* facilities at Ribstone on the G.T.P.
22370·45	Application for siding Toronto Sewer Pipe Company, Grand Trunk Railway.
24285	Application for farm crossing (2) in the vicintty of Foster Station, C.P.R.
9437·1141	Application for an alarm bell, County Road No. 11, Wellington County, Fergus, Ont., C.P.R.
G–2263	Complaint *re* access to C.N.R. tracks at Fallowfield, Ont.
25812	Application for an agent at Gibb, Sask., C.P.R.
4205·61	Application of G.T.P. to remove its agent from Griffin, Sask.
4205·59	Application of G.T.P. to remove its agent from Gregg, Man.
25559	Complaint *re* train service between Grand Mere and Three Rivers, C.P.R.
4205·38	Application of C.P.R. to remove its agent from Grass Hill, Ont.
3701·150	Complaint *re* farm crossing Mileage 139·93, C.L.O. & W. Ry.
25668	Complaint *re* train service to and from Glenora, Man., C.N.R.
25218	Application for a suitable crossing at Garneau Jct. Station, C.N.Q.
25212	Complaint *re* Grand Trunk train service between Stratford and Palmerston, G.T.R.
24918	Application for a farm crossing, Lot 253, Parish of Pointe du Lac, C.P.R.
17420·1	Complaint *re* train service, Gross Isle, Man., C.N.R.
24942	Complaint *re* railway company changing time table without giving sufficient notice to the public.
24604	Complaint *re* lack of station facilities at Gleaeven, Sask., C.P.R.
25765	Application for station facilities at Hatzic, B.C., C.P.R.
25610	Application for a station agent at, and improved station facilities at Horizon, Sask., C.P.R.
9437·1248	Protection at Regent Street, Hawkesbury, G.T.R.
9437·1247	Protection at crossing, Lot 11-A, West Hawkesbury, G.T.R.
4205·55	Complaint *re* removal of agent Hemsford, N.S., N. & S.W. Railway.
9437·608	Protection at Main Street and Ferguson Avenue, Hamilton, G.T.R.
4205·45	Complaint *re* closing of Harrison Mills Station, C.P.R.
4205·49	Application of C.P.R. to remove agent from Hawk Lake.
18181	Application of C.P.R. to remove the agent from Hammond, B.C.
9437·1228	*Re* condition of crossing over G.T.R. between Lots 9 and 10, Concession 4, Tp. of Hawkesbury.
4205·19	Application of C.N.R. to remove the agent at Howick, Alta.
4205·21	Application of C.N.R. to remove the agent at Homewood, Man.
24752	Complaint *re* C.N.R. train No. 6 not stopping at Haultain, Sask.
19855·23	Matter of train service between Montreal and Highlands and Adirondack Jct. C.P.R. and N.Y.C.
15259	Complaint *re* M.C.R. using spur on Railroad Alley, Hagersville, Ont.
24610	Complaint *re* I.B. & O. Railway not constructing farm crossing in the vicinity of Harcourt.
24736	Complaint *re* C.P.R. removing spur line Sandy Hook Realty Company.
20981	Unsatisfactory condition of fencing on C.P.R. between Yahk and Kingsgate.
24693	Complaint *re* overcrowding of passenger cars from Montreal in Southern Counties Railway.
4205·9	Application of C.P.R. to remove agent at Ivry, Que.
19475·4	Complaint *re* rate on household effects and refusal of railway companies to provide 40-ft. cars.
24747	Complaint *re* C.P.R. closing the crossing at Isle Cadieux.
24258	Application for approval of aerial tramway over G.T.R., Inglewood.
4214·43	Complaint *re* facilities for handling fruit from the Niagara District, G.T.R.
4205·15	Complaint *re* removal of agent from Jeannette Station, C.P.R.
20120	Application for facili ies at Junkin, Alta., G.T.P.
22616	Complaint *re* no water in stockyards at Sudbury, C.P.R.
24310	Complaint *re* train service, Kootenay Valley Ry.
994·161	Complaint *re* fencing on Grand Trunk in the vicinity of Maple Lake, Ont.
9437·1165	Complaint *re* crossing at Ketepec Station, C.P.R.
9437·1166	Complaint *re* crossing between Katepec and Acarac, C.P.R.
9437·1202	Complaint *re* Kingston Road crossing near West Hill, G.T.R.
25231	Complaint *re* train service, Kerrwood, Ont., G.T.R.
18863·28	Application for farm crossing near Rainy Hills, Alta., C.P.R.
25555	Application to have C.P.R. train No. 21 stop at Kempton.
9437·1249	Complaint *re* dangerous crossing at Milestone 2·1, Kamloops, C.P.R.
25632	Application for depot unloading platform at Lydden, Sask., G.T.P.
24666	Application for well in stockyards at Landie, Sask., G.T.P.
25585	Application for stockyard and loading platform at Leipsic, Sask., C.P.R.
25512	Application for a flag station at Little River East, A.Q. and W. Ry.

No. 23.—STATEMENT showing Complaints and Applications Referred to the Operating Department for Report, Year ending March 31, 1915—*Continued.*

File Number.	Particulars.
4205-42	Application of C.P.R. to remove its agent from Lavaat Station.
25195	Application for an agent at Laval des Rapids, C.P.R.
4205-36	Application of C.P.R. to remove its agent from Lakeside Station, Ont.
21173-1	Complaint *re* manner C.N.R. handling certain passenger trains between Trenton and Belleville.
25338	Complaint *re* C.N.R. employing a man as hostler who has not passed examinations.
4205-22	Application of C.N.R. to remove its agent from Laurette Station.
22793	Application of C.N.R. to remove its agent from Ladysmith, Man.
4205-14	Application of C.N.R. to remove its agent from Lavoie Station.
25212	Complaint *re* train service for school children going to Listowel from stations south thereof. G.T.R.
9437-1211	Matter of protection at Dundas Street crossing, London, Ont., G.T.R.
25146	Application to have C.P.R. train number 2 stop at Larchwood, Ont.
24899	Application for a station agent at Lyndhurst, Ont., C.N.O. Railway.
3565-5	Complaint *re* train service between Laird and Dalmeny, C.N.R.
24524	Application to construct Ashland Avenue across tracks of G.T.R., London, Ont.
24928	Complaint *re* Brantford and Hamilton Electric not waiting for passengers at Cainsville.
24803	Application for a station nine miles from Malakawa, B.C., C.P.R.
24821	Complaint *re* cancellation of C.P.R. trains Nos. 511 and 512 between Lethbridge and Medicine Hat.
24756	Complaint *re* unsatisfactory service at Courtright, P.M.R.
23938	Complaint *re* unsatisfactory train service on Irondale and Bancroft Ry. (C.N.R.)
G-2245	Complaint *re* reduction in train service C.P.R. Lyleton Subdivision.
2142-1	Petition for a roadway to the station at New Sydenham (Leyland Siding), C.N.R.
9437-1138	Application for protection at crossing over C.P.R. tracks to hospital for the insane, London, Ont.
24117	Application for approval of station at Lac Aux Sables, C.N.Q.
9437-1252	Complaint *re* dangerous crossing in the village of Mona Road, C.P.R.
25751	Complaint *re* train service, G.T.P., Biggar to Loverna Branch.
25280	Complaint *re* unsatisfactory train service to and from Milton, Ont., C.P.R.
25602	Application for stock yards at Mitchelton, Sask., C.N.R.
25577	Complaint *re* condition of platform at Methven Station, C.P.R.
25548	Complaint *re* condition of flag station at Middleport, Ont., G.T.R.
25487	Complaint *re* Quebec Oriental Railway placing obstruction near highway, Maria, Que.
25367	Complaint *re* service on Montreal and Southern Counties Railway.
25481	Complaint *re* train service between Maynooth and Trenton, C.N.O. Ry.
4205-18	Application of C.N.R. to remove the agent from Mafeking Station.
4205-35	Application of C.P.R. to remove agent from its station at Montrose West.
4205-28	Application of C.N.R. to remove its agent from Margaret Station.
4205-17	Application of C.P.R. to remove its agent from Meadows, Man.
25276	Complaint *re* train service on C.N.R. at Marchand, Man.
25154	Complaint *re* lack of scales in stock yard at Melville, G.T.P.
21645	Application for a station agent at Mazeppa, Alta., C.P.R.
24750	Complaint *re* C.N.R. refusing to provide farm crossing between Mikado and Veregin.
G-2410	*Re* station facilities at Mimico, Grand Trunk Railway.
24904	Complaint *re* G.T.R. providing second class accommodation for holders of first-class tickets
G-2379	*Re* condition of C.N.R. tracks at Mileage 175, Rideau Subdivision.
9437-125	Complaint *re* alleged dangerous condition of crossing of Main Road between Brockville and Smith's Falls, C.P.R.
9437-1164	Complaint *re* dangerous condition of crossing at Martinon, N.B., on C.P.R.
1750-91	Application of C.P.R. for approval of clearances on Contractor's Supply Co's Siding, MP. 20, Owen Sound Sub.
24489	Petition asking for better train service at Horningside, Alta., C.P.R.
455-44	Petition to have C.P.R. erect cattle guards through sections 24 and 25, Millet, Alta.
24492	Application to discontinue flag stop at Benson and Ross Spur and Meadows Spur, C.N.R.
24484	Application of C.P.R. to remove its agent from Manvers Station.
24442	Complaint *re* lack of farm crossing, Q.M. & S. Ry., in the vicinity of La Baie, Que.
1700-73	Application to recover demurrage on car from New York Central before same was placed on G.T.R. tracks.
24427	Application for improved train service to and from Maxville, G.T.R.
4205-37	Application of C.P.R. to remove its agent from McAlpine Station.
9994-186	Complaint *re* C.P.R. erecting a fence in front of certain property in the vicinity of Hartley.
24951	Complaint *re* seat in passenger coach being occupied by another party during the absence of the original holder.
17913	Application for a siding on G.T.P. at St. Louis, Sask.
9437-1221	Matter of protection at Front Street, C.N. Ry. New Westminster, B.C.
25715	Application for improved station facilities at Nevla, Sask., G.T.P.
25688	Application for a loading platform at Navarre Siding, Alta., C.P.R.

No. 23.—STATEMENT showing Complaints and Applications Referred to the Operating Department for Report, Year ending March 31, 1915.—*Continued.*

File Number.	Particulars.
4205·52	Complaint *re* removal of agent from Newburg, C.N.O. Ry.
25471	Complaint *re* station accommodation and train service on C.P.R., Norwood, Ont.
25448	Complaint *re* train service on G.T.R. between North Bay and Huntsley.
4205·39	Application of C.P.R. to remove its agent from Newtonville.
4205·27	Application of C.N.R. to remove its agent from Neelin, Man.
4205·16	Application of C.N.R. to remove its agent from Norquay, Sask.
3878·578	Complaint *re* condition of farm crossing, Lot 3, Con. of Montague, C.N.Ry.
23253·1	Application of M.C.R. to construct a spur line over Bender Street, Niagara Falls.
9437·1174	Application of C.P.R. to remove speed restriction at Nipissing.
24691	Application for a site for coal shed, Netherhill, C.N.R.
24652	Application for a crossing between Cons. 15 and 16, Mun. of Neeving, C.P.R.
24233	Complaint *re* construction of crossing Twentieth Side Line, Mun. of Neeving, C.P.R.
17157·18	Complaint *re* train service on C.P.R., Swift Current—Southwesterly Branch.
24501	Application for a siding at Nowness, Sask., C.P.R.
16939·5	Enquiry as to trainmen's duty as to taking milk cans off train.
6713·97	Application of C.N.R. for interchange with G.T.R., Ottawa, Ont.
25447	Complaint Ontario Commercial Travellers Association, *re* proposed change in schedule of G.T.R.
4205·48	Complaint *re* C.P.R. removing its agent from Oro, Ont.
25096	Complaint *re* C.P.R. and G.T.R. not furnishing proper facilities for apple facilities.
Case 3050	*Re* protection at Queen Street West, Grand Trunk, Ottawa.
24193	Complaint *re* train connections at Orillia, G.T.R.
25703	Application for a station agent at Parkside, Sask., C.N.R.
6713·63	Matter of interswitching between G.T.R. and C.P.R., Port Hope, Ont.
4205·62	Complaint *re* proposed closing of station at Pointe au Chene as a regular agency, C.P.R.
25563	Complaint *re* train service between Hardisty and Wilkie on C.P.R.
24099	Application of C.P.R. to close Purple Springs Station as a regular agency.
25379	*Re* location of Pacific Great Eastern site at Prince George.
25368	Complaint *re* train service at Glenora, Man., C.N.R.
25176	Application for an agent at Primate, Sask., the year round, C.P.R.
4205·26	Application of C.N.R. to close Pinkham, Sask., as a regular agency.
G-2476	Matter of switching and handling of passenger trains at Port Dover, Ont., G.T.R.
9437·1208	Complaint *re* dangerous crossing near mill just outside town limits, Port Dover, G.T.R.
22611	*Re* protection at crossing west end of station grounds, Piapot, Sask., C.P.R.
25115	Complaint *re* loss of oats in transit from Munster, Sask., C.N.R.
25688	Complaint *re* alleged discrimination between owners of autos and taxis in connection with conveying passengers to and from C.P.R. depot, Winnipeg, Man.
24710	Application to have G.T.R. restore opening in fence on north side of C.P.R. westbound track, Parkdale, Ont.
24887	Complaint *re* train service on C.N.R. north of Parry Sound.
24788	Complaint *re* lack of proper station facilities at Prince, Sask., C.N.R.
11929·1	Complaint *re* lack of proper crossing at Prince, Sask., C.N.R.
12924·193	Complaint *re* train service on the C.N.R., Vegreville Branch.
9437·1142	Application to have C.P.R. provide a flagman at Fourth Avenue crossing, Prince Albert, Sask.
23565	Application for a flag station at Range St. Alix, C.P.R. Piles Branch.
25616	Complaint *re* delay of C.N.R. in hauling live stock at Quebec.
24896	Complaint *re* unsatisfactory train service between La Tuque and Rivière à Pierre Jct., C.N.Q. Ry.
9437·279	*Re* protection at Talbot Avenue, Winnipeg, Man., C.P.R.
25393	Complaint *re* inadequate Sunday train service, Windham, Ont., M.C.R.
25662	Application for a siding on the Denholm-Prince Albert Branch of C.N.R.
25674	Complaint *re* train service on Wolsley-Reston Branch, C.P.R.
25046	Application for a crossing over line of C.N.R., Martin Street, White Rock, B.C.
23815	Application of C.N.R. to remove the connection between C.P.R. and Winnipeg Joint Terminals, Higgins Avenue, Winnipeg.
22696·3	Complaint *re* inadequate train service on C.N.R. between Winnipeg and Riverton.
25308	Complaint *re* train service between Winnipeg and Gypsumville, C.N.R.
23795	Application of C.N.R. to close Wilmar Station as a regular agency.
22720	Application of C.N.R. to close Weldon Station as a regular agency.
4205·20	Application of C.N.R. to close Warren Station as a regular agency.
25268	Application for stock yards at Waseca, Sask., C.N.R.
15350	Application for a station at Waseca, Sask., on C.N.R.
25056	Application of C.P.R. to close its station at Wattsburg, as a regular agency.
3861	*Re* crossing of C.P.R., Portage Avenue, Winnipeg, Man.
24943	Application to extend Mid-Winter Park crossing over tracks of C.P.R., Winnipeg, Man.
24620	Complaint *re* condition of roadbed on G.T.R. between Depot Harbour and Parry Sound.
9437·1163	Complaint *re* level crossing between Westfield and Hillandale, C.P.R.

No. 23.—STATEMENT showing Complaints and Applications Referred to the Operating Department for Report, Year ending March 31, 1915.—*Continued.*

File Number.	Particulars.
688	Complaint *re* switching and shunting over crossing known as Gravel Road, in the city of St. Thomas, P.M.R.
25752	Complaint *re* reduction in train service on the G.T.P., Young to Hoey Branch.
25079	Complaint *re* dispatch of freight from Yarker, Ont., C.N.O.
23219	Application of G.T.R., to construct siding for a Stone Company at Windmill Point.
24402	Complaint *re* smoke nuisance and noise of trains, along river front, Walkerville, Ont., G.T.R.
2494-16	Complaint *re* condition of cattle guards on C.P.R., near Coleman, Ont.
24215	Application for stock yard and loading chute at Wisetown, Sask., C.N.R.
25732	Petition for stock yards at Yawn, Sask., C.N.R.
22724	Application for an agent at Valor, Sask., C.P.R.
25575	Complaint *re* unsatisfactory approach to station at Vulcan, Alta., C.N.R.
4205-50	Application of C.N.R. to close Vermilion Bay as a regular agency.
4205-34	Application of C.P.R. to remove agent from Vienna Station.
9437-1190	Application for a subway under G.T.R. at French Road west of Vaudreuil, Que.
9437-1200	Complaint *re* crossing in the vicinity of Water Street subway, Winnipeg, Man.
Case 3042	*Re* crossing at Main Street, Vegreville, Alta., C.N.R.
24639	Petition for removal of cattle guards, Vars, Ont., G.T.R.
24671	Complaint *re* unsatisfactory express service on fruit shipments from the Niagara District.
24585	Complaint *re* C.P.R. discontinuing station at Victoria Park.
24574	Application for a station at Vera, Sask., G.T.P.
4205-60	Application of G.T.P. to close Uno Station as a regular agency.
25657	Complaint *re* C.P.R. hauling steel and wooden coaches in the same train.
24082	Application of C.N.R. to remove agent from Underhill Station.
25627	*Re* delay to shipment of stock from Sinclair on C.P.R.
25628	Complaint *re* train service at Tilbury, Ont., C.P.R.
25452	Complaint *re* conditions at Terrebonne, C.P.R.
25526	Complaint *re* overcrowding of C.P.R. 1.15 p.m. train from Toronto.
4205-41	Application of C.P.R. to close station at Tilley, Alta., as a regular agency.
4205-8	Application of C.P.R. to remove the agent from Tache Station.
25347	Complaint *re* train service at Lorette and Dufresne, C.N.R.
6713-87	*Re* interswitching at Treaton between C.O.R., C.P.R. and G.T.R.
9437-704	*Re* protection at Boyce Avenue, Northern Division, G.T.R., Toronto.
9437-589	*Re* protection at St. Clair Avenue, G.T.R., Toronto.
22806	Complaint *re* shunting on Division Street, Trenton, Ont., C.N.O.
22820	*Re* location of station at Tribune, C.P.R.
23637	Complaint *re* train service at Cutler, B.C., C.P.R.
9437-1156	Matter of protection at Victoria Street, Tweed, Ont., C.P.R.
24 24	Petition for a station agent at Turtleford, Sask., C.N.R.
24361	Complaint *re* refusal of C.P.R. to sell seats in sleeping cars after 10 p.m.
9437-1245	Application for protection at crossing at Stevensville, Ont., M.C.R.
25711	Application for station and siding at Parish of St. Viateur, Que., C.P.R.
25482	Application for stock yard at Stanmore, Alta., C.N.R.
20320	Application for the appointment of an agent at Smiley, G.T.P.
4205-57	Application of C.P.R. to remove agent from St. Constant Station.
25590	Application for an agent at Sibbald, Alta., C.N.R.
25518	Application to establish a station at St. Joseph de Sorel, Q.M. & S. Ry.
22902-16	Application for a station at St. Telesphore, Que., C.P.R.
25492	Complaint *re* dismissal of signalman at Sharbot Lake, C.P.R.
4205-44	Application of C.P.R. to close Snow Road Station as a regular agency.
25451	Complaint *re* change in train service through Similkameen, G.N.R.
18710	Application for a station in the Parish of St. Hermans, C.N.R.
25404	Complaint *re* cancellation of 8 p.m. train from St. Jerome to Montreal on C.P.R.
4205-12	Application of C.N.R. to remove agent from St. Laurent Station.
16895	Application of C.N.R. to remove agent from Sleemans Station.
25185	Complaint *re* train service at Starkville, Ont., C.N.O
1686	*Re* station and agent at St. Canut, Que., C.N.R.
25161	Request to have C.N.R. train in the morning start from St. Canut instead of St. Jerome.
24472	Complaint *re* condition of station at St. Felix de Valois, Que.
24635	Application to have C.P.R. stop trains Nos. 13 and 14 at Strathmore.
24594	*Re* location of C.N.R. station at Stonefield, Que.
24729	Complaint *re* train service on G.T.R. between St. Marys and Sarnia Tunnel.
9437-1161	Complaint *re* conditions at crossing between Sagwa and Lingley, N.B., C.P.R.
24670	Complaint *re* train service Sturgeon Falls, C.P.R.
24495	Complaint *re* condition of a number of highway crossings on the C.P.R. in the Municipality of Sherwood.
24533	Complaint *re* train service and connections at Sudbury, C.P.R.
22928	Complaint *re* lack of agent and telegraph service at Secretan, Sask., C.P.R.
25727	Complaint *re* unsatisfactory stock train service between Red Deer and Calgary, C.P.R.

No. 23.—STATEMENT showing Complaints and Applications Referred to the Operating Department for Report, Year ending March 31, 1915.—*Continued.*

File Number.	Particulars.
25485	Complaint *re* train service on Moosejaw-Portal Section, C.P.R.
16305·16	Request to have G.T.P. extend its Moosejaw-North Westerly branch to Riverhurst, Sask.
4205·25	Application of C.N.R. to close Rosebank as a regular agency.
19031	Application of C.N.R. to remove its agent from Ridpath Station.
25120	*Re* interchange of passengers between N. & N. Ry., and Cumberland Coal Co., Royston, B.C.
24483	Application for a permanent agent at Red Jacket, Sask., C.P.R.
24892	Application of C.P.R. to remove station from Reford to Conquest.
23006	Protest against action of C.P.R. in withdrawing agent from Bittern Lake.
24311	Application for an order directing the C.N.R., and C.P.R., to provide a joint station at Rocky Mountain House.
4214·106	Matter of express delivery limits in the city of Regina, Sask.
19084	Application for a station agent at Ralph, Sask., C.P.R.
21297	Application to remove night signalman at interlocking plant, C.P.R., and C.N.R., Birds Hill.
12924·44	Application to remove night signalman at interlocking plant, C.N.R., and G.T.P., Camrose.
Case 1919	Application to remove night signalman at interlocking plant, G.T.P., and C.N.R., South Saskatoon.
1795·2	Application to remove night signalman at interlocking plant, G.T.P., and C.N.R., Dana.
10795·1	Application to remove night signalman at interlocking plant, G.T.P., and C.P.R., Neeley.
Case 1918	Application to remove night signalman at interlocking plant, G.T.P., and C.P.R., Deer.
10796·1	Application to remove night signalman at interlocking plant, G.T.P., and C.P.R., Oban.
18036·2	Application to remove night signalman at interlocking plant, C.P.R., and G.T.P., Reford.
14134·6	Application to remove night signalman at interlocking plant, C.N.R., and C.P.R., Forward.
15832·3	Application to remove night signalman at interlocking plant, C.P.R., and G.T.P., Druid (Dodsland).
Case 1920	Application to remove night signalman at interlocking plant, G.T.P., and C.N.R., Hart.
1804	Application to remove night signalman at interlocking plant, C.N.R., and G.N.R., Minto.
1434	Application to remove night signalman at interlocking plant, C.N.R., and C.P.R., Hartney.
11395	Application to remove night signalman at interlocking plant, C.N.R., and G.T.P., Riley.
406	Application to remove night signalman at interlocking plant, C.N.R., and C.P.R., Holfield.
14694	Application to remove night signalman at interlocking plant, C.N.R., and G.T.P., St. Boniface.
14942·18	Application to remove night signalman at interlocking plant, G.T.P., and C.N.R., Leaman.
11071	Application to remove night signalman at interlocking plant, C.P.R., and C.N.R., Maryfield.
10791·7	Application to remove night signalman at interlocking plant, G.T.P., and C.N.R., Lampman.
10791·2	Application to remove night signalman at interlocking plant, G.T.P., and C.P.R., Griffin.
11837	Application to remove night signalman at interlocking plant, C.P.R., and G.T.P., Yorkton.
10821·7	Application to remove night signalman at interlocking plant, C.P.R., and G.T.P., Alix.
10791·22	Application to remove night signalman at interlocking plant, G.T.P., and C.P.R., Frobisher.
Case 1466	Application to remove night signalman at interlocking plant, C.P.R., and C.N.R., Morris.
1021	Application to remove night signalman at interlocking plant, C.P.R., and C.N.R., Findlay.
13975·1	Application to remove night signalman at interlocking plant, C.P.R., and C.N.R., Conquest.
1519·25	Application to remove night signalman at interlocking plant, C.N.R., and G.T.P., Fort William.
10796·4	Application to remove night signalman at interlocking plant, C.P.R., and C.N.R., Midale.
2149	Application to remove night signalman at interlocking plant, C.N.R., and G.N.R., Carman.
1803	Application to remove night signalman at interlocking plant, C.N.R., and G.N.R., Wakopa.
12924·3	Application to remove night signalman at interlocking plant, C.N.R., and C.P.R., Stetler.
2230	Application to remove night signalman at interlocking plant, C.N.R., and G.N.R., Roland.
12476	Application to remove night signalman at interlocking plant, C.P.R., and C.N.R., Bienfient.
12924·45	Application to remove night signalman at interlocking plant, C.P.R., and C.N.R. Nightingale.
2578·10	Application to remove night signalman at interlocking plant, C.P.R., and C.N.R., Rosetown.
11642	Application to remove night signalman at interlocking plant, C.P.R., and C.N.R., Carlyle.
12924·9	Application to remove night signalman at interlocking plant, C.P.R., and C.N.R., Dalroy.
2450	Application to remove night signalman at interlocking plant, G.T.P., and C.N.R., Parel.
360	Application to remove night signalman at interlocking plant, C.N.R., and C.P.R., Brookdale (Munroe).
18571	Application to remove night signalman at interlocking plant, C.P.R., and C.N.R., Carberry.
Case 2229	Application to remove night signalman at interlocking plant, C.N.R., and C.P.R., Kaiser.
207	Application to remove night signalman at interlocking plant, C.P.R., and C.N.R., Emerson.
15499·25	Application to remove night signalman at interlocking plant, C.N.R., and C.P.R., Delta Junction.
. . . . .	Application to remove night signalman at interlocking plant, C.N.R., and C.P.R., Methven Junction.
25717	Application to remove night signalman at interlocking plant, G.T.R, and C.P.R., North of Glencoe.

No. 23.—STATEMENT showing Complaints and Applications Referred to the Operating Department for Report, Year ending March 31, 1915—*Concluded.*

File Number.	Particulars.
1420	Application to remove night signalman at interlocking plant, G.T.R., and C.N.O., Mount Albert.
Case 48	Application to remove signalman at interlocking plant, C.N.Q., and Nat. Trans., near Tawachiche, Que.
Case 267	Application to remove night signalman at interlocking plant, C.P.R., and G.N.R., Elm Creek.
1841	Application to remove night signalman at interlocking plant, G.N.R., and C.P.R., Boissevain.
1984	Application to remove night signalman at interlocking plant, G.N.R., and C.P.R., Carroll (Hedron).
2231	Application to remove night signalman at interlocking plant, C.P.R., and G.N.R., Plumcoulee.
2811	Application to remove night signalman at interlocking plant, G.N.R., and G.T.P., Morden.

Total—437.

APPENDIX G.

PERMANENT STAFF OF THE BOARD OF RAILWAY COMMISSIONERS FOR CANADA FOR THE YEAR ENDING MARCH 31, 1915.

TRAFFIC DEPARTMENT.

Name.	Position.	Date of Order in Council.	Salary.
			$
Hardwell, J.	Chief Traffic Officer	June 22, 1904	5,000
Brown, G. A.	Chf. Clk., Traffic Dept	Oct. 3, 1904	2,300
McManus, C. E.	Clerk, Traffic Dept	Aug. 20, 1904	1,350
Routhier, C. C.	" "	Aug. 14, 1906	1,350
Lalonde, F.	" "	May 6, 1907	1,200
Allen, J. S.	" "	May 6, 1907	1,200
Messinger, H. W.	" "	July 8, 1904	1,100
Usher, J. R.	" "	May 6, 1907	1,050
Wainwright, W. R. G.	" "	April 27, 1909	1,050
Chapman, C. M. B.	" "	April 11, 1907	950
	Reappointed	Sept. 24, 1913	
	(To take effect	Sept. 1, 1913)	
Harvey, R.	Clerk, Traffic Dept	Oct. 6, 1911	900
	(To take effect	June 12, 1911)	
Brethour, L. L.	Clerk, Traffic Dept	Dec. 2, 1911	900
	(To take effect	June 5, 1911)	
Drum, A. B.	Clerk, Traffic Dept	Feb. 6, 1913	850
	(To take effect	Feb. 1, 1913)	

ENGINEERING DEPARTMENT.

Mountain, G. A.	Chief Engineer	June 30, 1904	5,000
Simmons, T. L.	Asst. Chief Engineer	Oct. 3, 1904	3,000
Drury, H. A. K.	1st Asst. Engineer	June 25, 1906	[1]3,300
Belanger, A. A.	2nd Asst. Engineer	May 28, 1910	2,900
Kerr, A. T.	3rd Asst. Engineer	Aug. 1, 1911	[1]3,000
Murphy, J.	Electrical Engineer	May 15, 1906	[2]
Foulds, J. R.	Clerk, Engineers' Dept	Aug. 14, 1906	1,100
Wadsworth, E. W.	" "	Sept. 12, 1912	850
	(To take effect	Sept. 1, 1911)	
Barber, Miss E. A. H.	Stenographer	May 8, 1907	[4]950
McDonald, Miss N.	"	Oct. 14, 1910	[4]950
	(To take effect	June 17, 1910)	
Bliss, Miss M.	Stenographer	May 29, 1911	[4]900
	(To take effect	April 1, 1911)	

RECORD DEPARTMENT.

Thomson, J. W.	Chief Clerk Records	Sept. 1, 1904	1,400
Huband, C. S.	Acting Record Officer	May 2, 1905	[3]1,500
Jamieson, W. A.	Clerk, Record Room	Aug. 14, 1906	1,100
Langelier, D.	" "	Aug. 20, 1904	1,050
Martin, J. E.	" "	May 6, 1907	1,050
Demers, F. R.	Statistical Clerk Records	Aug. 31, 1906	1,000
Chambers, D. H.	Clerk, Record Room	June 29, 1910	1,000
Lyon, N. B.	" "	May 11, 1911	950
	(To take effect	Jan. 1, 1911)	
Carruthers, J. P.	Clerk, Record Room	Sept. 12, 1912	900
	(To take effect	Oct. 1, 1911)	
Edwards, F. A.	Clerk, Record Room	Oct. 19, 1912	850
	(To take effect	July 1, 1912)	
Lajoie, V.	Clerk, Record Room	Dec. 10, 1912	850
	(To take effect	July 1, 1912)	

[1] Includes Living Allowance of $300 during residence in West.

PERMANENT STAFF OF THE BOARD OF RAILWAY COMMISSIONERS FOR CANADA FOR THE YEAR ENDING MARCH 31, 1915.—*Continued.*

SECRETARY'S DEPARTMENT.

Name.	Position.	Date of Order in Council.	Salary.
			$
Ecclestone, A. E.	Chf. Clk., Secy's. Dept.	Aug. 14, 1906	1,550
Arbick, J.	Clerk, Secy's Branch	May 2, 1905	1,050
	(To take effect	Dec. 23, 1904)	
Larocque, A.	Clerk, Secy's Branch	Dec. 31, 1908	1,000
Hollington, P.	" "	Oct. 19, 1912	850
	(To take effect	Sept. 1, 1912)	
Timmins, J.	Clerk, Secy's Branch	Feb. 6, 1913	850
	(To take effect	Sept. 1, 1912)	
Latour, T. D.	Mailing Clerk	Dec. 31, 1907	850
Bourgault, L.	Clerk, Secy's Branch	Dec. 8, 1913	800
	(To take effect	Sept. 1, 1913)	
Gamble, Miss C. L.	Stenographer	July 19, 1912	650
	(To take effect	June 1, 1912)	
MacGuire, Miss E.	Stenographer	July 27, 1912	650
	(To take effect	July 1, 1912)	
Murphy, Mrs. L.	Stenographer	Jan. 25, 1913	650
	(To take effect	July 1, 1912)	
Hardy, Miss J.	Stenographer	Sept. 24, 1913	650
	(To take effect	April 1, 1913)	
Parish, Miss P.	Stenographer	Nov. 21, 1913	650
	(To take effect	April 1, 1913)	

ASSISTANT SECRETARY'S DEPARTMENT.

Primeau, E. A.	Asst. Secretary for French correspondence, etc.	May 7, 1904	3,000
Lapointe, A.	Accountant	May 6, 1907	1,200
Casey, T. H.	Clerk, Asst. Secy's Branch	Aug. 28, 1909	950
	(To take effect	Aug. 9, 1909)	
Turcot, Miss A. M.	Stenographer	May 29, 1911	750
	(To take effect	April 1, 1911)	

OPERATING DEPARTMENT.

Spencer, Geo.	Chief Oprg. Officer	Sept. 24, 1913	3,600
[redacted]	(To take effect	Sept. 1, 1913)	
Lalonde, E. C.	Inspector, Oprg. Dept.	Aug. 20, 1904	2,300
Ogilvie, J.	Mechanical Expert	Mar. 4, 1907	2,300
McCaul, M. J.	Inspector, Oprg. Dept.	May 6, 1907	[1]2,300
Clark, J.	" "	May 6, 1907	2,000
Blyth, W. S.	" "	May 6, 1907	2,000
Hudson, A. E.	" "	May 3, 1912	[1]2,150
Gillett, L. D.	" "	May 3, 1912	1,850
Gardiner, J.	" "	May 3, 1912	[1]2,150
Harris, T.	Inspector, Oprg. Dept.	May 3, 1912	1,850
Shinnick, J. H.	" "	Dec. 31, 1909	[1]2,100
Poulin, A.	" "	July 28, 1911	1,300
	(To take effect	April 1, 1911)	
Ward, H. H.	Chf. Clk. Oprg. Dept.	Feb. 11, 1911	1,500
Nelson, E. E.	Clerk and Sten., Oprg. Dept.	April 7, 1914	[2]1,050
	(To take effect	Mar. 1, 1914)	
Britton, T. G.	Clerk, Oprg. Dept.	May 6, 1907	1,050
Dunsmore, T. D.	Clerk and Sten., Oprg. Dept.	Oct. 14, 1912	950
	(To take effect	May 6, 1912)	

[1]Includes Living Allowance of $300 during residence in West.
[2]Salary paid by Railways and Canals Department.
[3]Died November 25, 1914.
[4]Includes Living Allowance of $150 during residence in West.

SESSIONAL PAPER No. 20c

PERMANENT STAFF OF THE BOARD OF RAILWAY COMMISSIONERS FOR CANADA FOR THE YEAR ENDING MARCH 31, 1915.—*Continued.*

OPERATING DEPARTMENT—*Continued.*

Name.	Position.	Date of Order in Council.	Salary.
			$
Parker, C. M.	Clerk and Sten., Oprg. Dept.	Oct. 14, 1912	850
	(To take effect	Aug. 1, 1912)	
Beggs, D. A.	Clerk, Oprg. Dept	Nov. 27, 1913	870
	(To take effect	April 1, 1913)	
O'Connor, Miss G. M	Stenographer	Dec. 31, 1908	800
Seroggie, Miss M. H	"	Jan. 25, 1913	650
	(To take effect	Oct. 1, 1912)	

FIRE INSPECTION DEPARTMENT.

Leavitt, C.	Chief Fire Inspector	Feb. 22, 1913	[3]800
	(To take effect	Jan. 1, 1913)	
Johnson, H. C.	Fire Inspector	Feb. 6, 1913	1,900
	(To take effect	Mar. 1, 1913)	
White, R. J.	Chief Clerk and Sten., Fire Insp. Dept	June 29, 1910	950

LAW DEPARTMENT.

Blair, A. G.	Law Clerk	Aug. 20, 1904	3,200
Larose, Miss R	Sten. and Librarian	May 2, 1905	1,000
Fligg, Miss C. L.	Stenographer	May 29, 1912	750
	(To take effect	April 1, 1912)	

CHIEF COMMISSIONER.

Richardson, R.	Secy. to Chief Commissioner and Acting Secy. outside Ottawa	April 12, 1905	2,500
Lewis, Miss L. J.	Clerk and Stenographer	May 7, 1904	950

LIBRARIAN.

Mills, James	Librarian and Supervising Officer	July 10, 1914	3,600
	(To take effect	Feb. 1, 1914)	
Ross, Miss M. G	Stenographer	Sept. 11, 1909	950

STENOGRAPHERS.

Cameron, Miss E. M.	Clerk and Stenographer to Comm. McLean	Aug. 20, 1904.	950
Casey, Miss N.	Clerk and Stenographer to Asst. Chief Comm.	Dec. 31, 1908	950
	(To take effect	Nov. 1, 1908)	
Vaughan, Miss M	Clerk and Stenographer to Comm. Goodeve	May 11, 1911	850
	(To take effect	Feb. 1, 1911)	

[1]Includes Living Allowance of $300 during residence in West.

[2]Includes Living Allowance of $150 during residence in West.

[3]The salary of Mr. Leavitt is $3,500 per annum; difference paid by the Conservation Commission

PERMANENT STAFF OF THE BOARD OF RAILWAY COMMISSIONERS FOR CANADA FOR THE YEAR ENDING MARCH 31, 1915.—*Concluded.*

MESSENGERS.

Name.	Position.	Date of Order in Council.	Salary.
			$
Graham, F. D.	Messenger	Oct. 19, 1912	800
	(To take effect	Sept. 1, 1912)	
Barbeau, E. S.	Messenger	Sept. 11, 1909	700
Downes, Wm.	Messenger	Oct. 19, 1912	700
	(To take effect	Sept. 1, 1912)	
Wallace, A. J.	Messenger	Oct. 19, 1912	700
	(To take effect	Sept. 1, 1912)	

CAR "ACADIA".

Pile, Wm.	Cook on Official Car		90 per m.

REPORTING STAFF.

Butcher, N. R.	Reporting Contract	April 14, 1908	4,800

APPENDIX "H."

REPORT OF FIRE INSPECTION DEPARTMENT.

March 31, 1915.

A. D. CARTWRIGHT, Esq.,
Secretary, Board of Railway Commissioners,
Ottawa, Ontario.

SIR,—Herewith I beg to submit the report of the Fire Inspection Department for year ending March 31, 1915, for the tenth annual report of the board.

In general, the work of this department has consisted of the enforcement of General Order No. 107 of those sections of the Railway Act which relate specifically to fire protection. The work has been carried forward along the general lines indicated in previous reports.

ORGANIZATION.

As in previous years, the work of the department, aside from the head office at Ottawa, has been handled through co-operation with the several Dominion and provincial fire-protective organizations, without cost to the board. Under this arrangement, officials of the various fire-protective organizations acted as officers of the board, as follows:—

Dominion Forestry Branch, ten men, covering lines in the railway belt of British Columbia and forest sections in Alberta, Saskatchewan, Manitoba and Yukon Territory, outside Dominion parks.

Dominion Parks Branch, six men, covering lines in Dominion parks in British Columbia and Alberta.

British Columbia Forest Branch, thirty-two men, covering lines in British Columbia outside the railway belt.

Department of Agriculture of Alberta, four men, handling fire-guard inspection on lines in prairie sections of that province.

Fire Commissioner's office, province of Saskatchewan, one man, handling fire-guard inspection on lines in prairie sections of that province.

Department of Lands, Forests and Mines of Ontario, six men.

Department of Lands and Forests of Quebec, ten men.

Crown Lands Department of New Brunswick, two men.

It has not as yet been found practicable to arrange for co-operation in Nova Scotia.

RAILWAY FIRE PATROLS.

The plan of fire protection by patrols adopted in 1912 and 1913 was continued, with minor modifications.

Letters prescribing special patrols were issued to the following railway companies: Canadian Pacific Western Lines, Canadian Pacific Eastern Lines, Grand Trunk Pacific, Grand Trunk, Canadian Northern, Great Northern, Edmonton, Dunvegan and British Columbia, Kettle Valley (under construction), Western Canada Power Company, Quebec and Lake St. John, Canadian Northern Quebec, Temiscouata, Esquimalt and Nanaimo, and Victoria and Sidney.

INSTRUCTIONS TO RAILWAY EMPLOYEES.

Regulation 14 of General Order No. 107, which calls for the issuance of special instructions regarding the reporting and extinguishing of railway fires by railway employees, was generally well observed by railway companies.

REPORTING FIRES BY RAILWAYS.

Circular No. 133 was issued by the Secretary under date of May 5, 1914, requiring railways to report to the board all fires originating within 300 feet of the track in forested sections. These reports have assisted materially in carrying on the work of the department.

FOREST FIRE STATISTICS.

The fire season in 1914 was the most serious in many years in Ontario, Alberta and British Columbia and in the western portions of Quebec, dry spells of almost unprecedented severity occurring in both spring and fall. In Nova Scotia, New Brunswick and the eastern half of Quebec the climatic conditions were such that very little trouble from fire was experienced. However, the losses caused by fire over the whole Dominion were considerable, and there is no doubt that the losses along railway lines would have been very much greater had it not been for the preventive measures taken by the railways and by the Dominion and provincial agencies co-operating with them.

The following table shows approximate fire statistics as to forested sections along the principal railways subject to the board's jurisdiction. Statistics are not available as to the agricultural sections. Many incipient fires were extinguished of which the record is incomplete. While the statistics given are not strictly accurate in many cases, they are the best that could be secured.

RIGHT OF WAY CLEARING.

Notable progress was made by many railways in reducing the fire hazard by clearing up their rights of way. Probably more progress was made in this direction during 1914 than in any previous year. Special attention was given to this feature on lines under construction. In the past, much damage has been done by fires escaping beyond control in connection with railway construction work.

In a few cases, particularly along the Grand Trunk and Canadian Pacific (eastern lines) railways, there was co-operation between the railway company and the owners of adjacent lands, resulting in the disposal of inflammable debris on a narrow strip adjacent to the right of way. The best example of this occurred in Algonquin park, Ontario, where the Provincial Department of Lands, Forests and Mines employed a gang of men and cleared up the inflammable debris along a portion of the Grand Trunk right of way and lands immediately adjacent thereto, the Grand Trunk management bearing one-half the cost. It is expected that this arrangement will be continued in 1915, until the line through the park shall have been covered.

Along the Canadian Pacific line through the Shawanaga Indian reserve in Ontario, the Department of Indian Affairs disposed of inflammable debris on a strip adjacent to the railway, the company having cleared up the right of way independently.

In each of the above cases the department concerned is entitled to much credit for its progressive action. It is, however, important that general provision be made by legislation for the enforced disposal of inflammable debris immediately adjacent to railway lines, on privately owned lands, as well as on crown lands, whether licensed or unlicensed. At the very least, this action should be made effective at an early date in connection with all future cutting operations in forest sections. Such provision would be a measure of only reasonable justice to the railways.

FIRE GUARDS.

The fire guard requirements for 1914 were very closely similar to those prescribed for 1913, as explained in the ninth annual report. These requirements were made applicable to the Canadian Pacific, Canadian Northern, Grand Trunk Pacific and Great Northern railways in the prairie provinces. The principal features of the 1914 requirements are briefly as follows:—

Grain stubble lands.—Guards four feet in width 100 feet from the track to be ploughed by land owners or occupants, payment for same to be made by the railway company at the rate of $1.75 per lineal mile.

Fenced grazing land.—Guards to be ploughed by the company sixteen feet in width, 200 feet from the track, except that old guards previously ploughed at a greater distance are to be maintained. Burning of dry grass outside the right of way not required. Right of the company to enter upon land for the purpose of fire guarding to be subject to refusal of owners or occupant, the company to have the privilege of requesting authority from the board to enter upon such land, if it considers such action necessary.

Open prairie.—Guards to be ploughed by the company sixteen feet in width, 200 feet from the track, except that old guards previously ploughed at a greater distance are to be maintained. Dry grass and other unnecessary combustible matter to be burned off between the fire guard and the track. The company to have unrestricted right to enter upon such lands for the purpose of fire guarding.

During the year specific complaints were received as follows:—

Damage by fire.—Canadian Pacific 4, Canadian Northern 12, Grand Trunk Pacific 2, total 18. In each case, the complainant was advised that the board has no jurisdiction in connection with damage claims and that recourse should be had through the courts, in case of failure to reach a settlement with the railway concerned.

Failure to construct fire guards, or construction unsatisfactory: Canadian Pacific 3, Canadian Northern 5, Grand Trunk Pacific 1; total 9.

Report by railway company that landowner refuses to permit construction of fire guards in fenced grazing lands: Canadian Pacific 11, Grand Trunk Pacific 22; total 33. In twelve of these cases, the Grand Trunk Pacific requested authority to enter upon the lands in question for the purpose of constructing fire guards, notwithstanding such refusal of the owner. In three of these cases, orders were issued by the board, granting authority for such entrance and construction as requested.

SUMMARY of Fire Guard Construction by Railways in the Province of Alberta, Saskatchewan and Manitoba, 1914.

	Great Northern.	Grand Trunk Pacific.	Canadian Northern.	Canadian Pacific.
	Miles.	Miles.	Miles.	Miles.
Length in track, miles	162·38	2,152·8	4,541·20	6,313·13
Length in fire guard, miles[1]	324·76	4,305·6	9,082·40	12,626·26
Fireguards constructed (shown in fireguard miles)—				
Open Prairie	·50	1,240·80	2,346·60	3,970·90
Fenced grazing lands	171·50	404·85	387·50	1,374·41
Grain stubble lands	80·25	400·60	314·10	2,107·18
Total constructed	252·25	2,046·25	3,048·20	7,452·49
Fireguards not constructed (shown in fireguard miles)[2]				
Exemptions	53·76	1,442·00	3,368·00	2,276·30
Owner refuses entrance[3]	.....	9·30	*	23·00
Land already ploughed[4]	2·50	156·90	*	1,410·10
Grain stubble, not fireguarded by owner[5]	6·00	547·59	1,118·50	272·48
Miscellaneous other reasons	10·25	103·56	*	1,191·89
Total not constructed	72·54	2,259·35	6,034·20	5,173·77

*Total of these items amounts to 1,547·70.

[1]Fireguard mileage is double the track mileage, since the construction of fireguards is required on both sides of the track.

[2]Company exempted from fireguard construction, as to portions of line where showing made that such construction is unnecessary or impracticable.

[3]Employees of railway company refused permission, by owner, to enter upon land for purpose of constructing fireguards.

[4]Fireguarding unnecessary, because fields already ploughed.

[5]Fire guarding in cultivated land required only where the land owner or occupant would undertake to plough guard at the reasonable price specified by the board.

Locomotive Fuel.

Oil fuel is in exclusive use on 477 miles of the Canadian Pacific Railway, on 134 miles of the Esquimalt and Nanaimo Railway, and on 115 miles of the Great Northern Railway, a total of 726 miles, all in British Columbia. In no case has a definite report been submitted of a fire caused by an oil-burning engine in Canada. The Grand Trunk Pacific Railway have announced that during the spring and early summer of 1915, oil-burning engines will be installed on that portion of their lines in British Columbia and Alberta between Prince Rupert and Jasper, a distance of 718 miles. It is expected that this action will materially decrease the danger of fire along this portion of the line. The use of oil fuel is purely voluntary with the railways, and its adoption is dictated altogether by business considerations.

During the past two years, complaints have been received as to fire danger resulting from the use as locomotive fuel of certain classes of western coals. In order to secure expressions of opinion from all concerned, the board issued Circular No. 141, under date of January 25, 1915, containing the suggestion that it might be considered advisable to require a different kind of spark-arresting device on engines using such coals than the standard screen prescribed in Regulation 2 of General Order No. 107. The replies received indicate the need for further investigation, and as a result the situation will be carefully studied during the coming year, in the hope that some solution of the problem may be found that will cause the least possible hardship to all the interests affected. Both the Commission of Conservation and the Mines branch of the Department of Mines are co-operating in the investigation, the latter having assisted materially by making a number of analyses of samples of coal from the mines in question.

Hearings.

Upon complaint of the Dominion Forestry branch, the board held a hearing at Edmonton, Alta., on November 20, 1914, at which the Edmonton, Dunvegan and British Columbia Railway was cited to answer for alleged failure to comply with certain requirements of the Railway Act and of General Order No. 107, relative to fire protection. It was shown that the various features of the complaint were, in general, well founded, and judgment was reserved, in order to give the company an opportunity to comply with the various requirements.

On the same date, also at Edmonton, was heard the complaint of the Dominion Forestry branch against the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway for failure to extinguish a fire occurring earlier in the season on the Alberta coal branch of the railway. The board held that the case involved primarily the question of reimbursement of the cost of extinguishing the fire in question; this being a matter over which the board has no jurisdiction, the complainant was advised that recourse should be had through the courts, failing an adjustment direct with the company.

On March 17, 1915, the Canadian Pacific Railway applied to the board for certain modifications of General Order No. 107. Certain changes were asked as to the requirements for fire guard construction in the prairie provinces. The company requested also the elimination of subsection (*e*) of Regulation 13, General Order No. 107, which places upon railway companies the onus of extinguishing fires occurring within 300 feet of the track, unless in each case a showing shall be made that the company was not responsible for the origin of the fire. The case was set down for hearing at Ottawa, April 6, 1915.

Respectfully submitted,

(Signed) CLYDE LEVITT,

Chief Fire Inspector, B.R.C.

The above matters were fully discussed at the hearing held at Ottawa, April 6, 1915, and the application was dismissed (Order No. 141, April 15, 1915), except as the portion relating to the right of railway companies to enter upon fenced private lands for the purpose of ploughing fire guards, notwithstanding the protest of the owner or occupant; as to this portion of the application, judgment was reserved.

APPENDIX "I."

"I."

LIST OF BOOKS IN LIBRARY UP TO MARCH 31, 1915.

Abbott—Electrical Transmission of Energy.
Abbott—Railway Law of Canada.
Abbott—Telephony.
Ackworth—Elements of Railway Economics.
Actes du Canada et des Provinces non Abrogés par les Statuts Revisés, 1887.
Acts of the Provinces and of Canada not Repealed by the Revised Statutes, 1887.
Act to Regulate Commerce.
Adams—Railroad Accidents.
Adams—The Block System.
Alabama Railroad Commission Reports, 1909-1910.
Alberta Law Reports, 1908-1914.
Alberta Statutes, 1906-1914.
Allen—Telegraph Cases.
American Electrical Cases.
American and English Annotated Cases; Digest.
American and English Encyclopedia of Law; Supplement.
American and English Railroad Cases, Old and New Series; Digest.
American Railroad Journal.
American Railway Association Proceedings.
American Railway Reports.
American Reports, Digest.
Anderson—Dictionary of Law.
Anderson—Index-Digest of Interstate Commerce Laws.
Arizona Corporation Commission Reports.
Armstrong—Digest of Nova Scotia Reports.
Ashe—Electric Railways.
Audette—Practice of the Exchequer Court.
Auditor General's Reports.

Baldwin—American Railroad Law.
Barnes—Interstate Transportation.
Bartholomew—Air Brakes for Electric Cars.
Beach—Law of Railways.
Beach—Monopolies and Industrial Trusts.
Beach—Railway Digest (Annual).
Beal on Bailments.
Beal—Cardinal Rules of Legal Interpretation.
Beal and Wyman—Railroad Rate Regulation.
Beauchamp—Jurispreduce of the Privy Council.
Beaudry-Lacantinerie—Droit Civil.
Beavan and Walford—Railway Cases.
Bell and Dunn—Practice Forms.
Belsterling—Digest of Decisions—Transit Privileges.
Beullac—Code de Procédure Civile.
Bigg—General Railway Acts.
Biggar—Municipal Manual.
Bird—Digest of British Columbia Case Law.
Blakemore—Abolition of Grade Crossings in Massachusetts.
Bligh—Ontario Law Index to 1900.
Bligh and Todd—Dominion Law Index, 1898.
Booth—Street Railways.
Boulton—The Law and Practice of a Case Stated.
Bouvier's Law Dictionary.
Boyle and Waghorn—The Law and Practice of Compensation.
Boyle and Waghorn—The Law Relating to Railway and Canal Traffic.
Brandeis—Scientific Management.
Brassey, Lord—Fifty Years of Progress and the New Fiscal Policy.
Brice—Tramways and Light Railways.
Brice—Ultra Vires.
British Columbia Reports.

LIST OF BOOKS IN LIBRARY UP TO MARCH 31, 1915—*Continued.*

British Columbia Statutes.
British Columbia Year Book.
British Ruling Cases.
Brockway—Electric Railway Accounting.
Broom's Legal Maxims.
Browne—Law of Carriers.
Browne—The Law of Compensation.
Browne's Practice before the Railway Commissioners.
Brown, Macnamara and Neville—English Railway and Canal Traffic Cases.
Browne and Theobald—Law of Railways.
Bullinger—Postal and Shippers' Guide for the United States and Canada.
Butterworth—Practice of the Railway and Canal Commission.
Butterworth—Railways and Canals.
Byer—Economics of Railway Operation.

California Board of Public Utilities Annual Reports.
California Railroad Commission Reports.
Calvert—Regulation of Commerce.
Campbell—Forest Fires and Railways.
Cameron—Supreme Court Practice and Rules, 1913.
Canada Gazette.
Canada Law Journal.
Canada Legal Directory.
Canada and Newfoundland Gazetteer.
Canada Year Book.
Canadian Annual Digest.
Canadian Law Review.
Canadian Case Law Digest.
Canadian Law Times.
Canadian Reports, Appeal Cases.
Canadian Ten-Year Digest.
Car Builders' Dictionary.
Carmichael—Law of the Telegraph, Telephone and Submarine Cable.
Carter—When Railroads were new.
Cartwright's British North America Cases.
Cartwright's Canadian Law List.
Casson, Ellis and Hutchinson, Jr.—Horse, Truck and Tractor.
Century Dictionary and Cyclopedia.
Chandler—The Express Service and Rates.
Chambers—Parliamentary Guide.
Charter of the City of Montreal, with Amendments.
Chitty's Archbold's Q. B. Practice.
Chitty's K. B. Forms.
Clapp—The Navigable Rhine.
Clarke and Others—The American Railway.
Clarke's Street Accident Law.
Clarke—State Railroad Commissions.
Clark—Studies in History, Economics and Public Law. Standards of Reasonableness in Local Freight Discriminations.
Clements—Canadian Constitution.
Clements—Federal Supervision of Railroads.
Cleveland and Powell—Railroad Finance.
Cleveland and Powell—Railroad Promotion and Capitalization.
Clifton and Grunaux—A New Dictionary of the French and English Languages.
Clifton and Grunaux—Technological Dictionary, English, German, French.
Clode—Rating of Railways.
Colorado Public Utilities Commission Reports.
Colson—Abrégé de la Législation des Chemins de Fer et Tramways.
Columbia Public Utilities Commission Reports.
Commission of Conservation Reports.
Commission Telephone Cases.
Congdon's Digest of Nova Scotia Reports.
Connecticut Public Utilities Commission Reports.
Connecticut Railroad Reports.
Connors—Report of the Working of American Railways.
Constantineau on the De Facto Doctrine.
Cooke and Townsend—Transportation.
Cooley—The American Railway. Its Construction, Development, Management, and Appliances.
Cooley on Taxation.
Copnall—A Practical Guide to the Administration of Highway Law.

LIST OF BOOKS IN LIBRARY UP TO MARCH 31, 1915—*Continued.*

Cowles—A General Freight and Passenger Post.
Coutlee's Digest Supreme Court Reports.
Criminal Code.
Croswell—The Law Relating to Electricity.
Curran—Freight Rates—Studies in Rate Construction.
Currier—Railway Legislation of the Dominion of Canada.
Cyclopedia of Law and Procedure. Annotations.

Dagger—Telephone Systems. The Ontario Telephone Act.
Daggett—Railroad Reorganization.
Daily Freight Register.
Dale and Lehmann—English Overruled Cases.
Daniell—Chancery Forms.
Darlington—Railway and Canal Traffic Acts.
Darlington's Railway Rates.
Daviel—Des Cours d'Eau.
Denis and White—Water Powers (Commission of Conservation).
Denton—Municipal Negligence (Highways).
Desbarats—Newspaper Directory.
Dewsnup—Railway Organization and Working.
Dictionary of Altitudes in Canada.
Directory of Railway Officials.
Disney's Carriage by Railway.
Dixon and Parmelee—Bureau of Railway Economics. The Arguments for and against Train-Crew Legislation.
Dodd—Law of Light Railways.
Doherty—Liability of Railroads to State.
Dorsey—English and American Railroads Compared.
Douglas—Development of the Railroads of North America and of Their Control by the State.
Douglas—The Influence of the Railroads of the United States and Canada on the Mineral Industry.
Drinker's Interstate Commerce Act. Supplement.
Droege—Freight Terminals and Trains.
Duff—Merchants Bank and Railroad Book-keeping.
Dunn—American Transportation Question.

Eaton—Railroad Operations. How to Know them.
Eaton—Handbook of Railroad Expenses.
Eddy on Combinations.
Edwards—Railway Nationalization.
Electric Train Staff Catalogue. Union Switch and Signal Co.
Elliott—The A B C of Railroad Signalling.
Elliott—The Individual, The Corporation, and the Government.
Elliott—Minnesota. The Railways and Advertising.
Elliott on Railroads.
Elliott on Roads and Streets.
Encyclopedia Britannica.
Encyclopedia of the Laws of England.
Endlich on Statutes.
English Law Reports. Digest.
English Reports (reprints).
English Ruling Cases.
Ewart's Digest of Manitoba Law Reports.
Exchequer Court Reports.
Express Companies—Judgment of the Board.
Express Statistics of the Dominion of Canada.
Express Statistics in the United States. Interstate Commerce Commission.

Farnham—Waters and Water Rights.
Frye—Civil Engineers' Pocket Book.
Fry—Specific Performance.
Fuzier-Herman—Code Civil. Supplement.
Fuzier-Herman—Répertoire du Droit Français.
Fetter—Carriers of Passengers.
Finch—Federal Anti-Trust Divisions.
Florida Railroad Commission Reports.
Floy—Valuation of Public Utility Properties.
Forney—Catechism of the Locomotive.
Foster—Engineering Valuation of Public Utilities and Factories.

LIST OF BOOKS IN LIBRARY UP TO MARCH 31, 1915—*Continued.*

Gear and Williams—Electric Central Station Distributing Systems.
Georgia Railroad Commission Reports.
Gephart—Transportation and Industrial Development in the Middle West.
Gilbert's Street Railway Reports.
Gillette's Hand Book of Cost Data.
Glen on Highways.
Goodeve—Railway Passengers.
Gould on Waters.
Gray's Communication by Telegraph.
Greene on Highways.
Grierson's Railway Rates, English and Foreign.
Guernsey—Effect of the War on Public Utilities.

Hadley—Railway Transportation.
Hadley—Railway Working and Appliances.
Haines' American Railway Management.
Haines—Railway Corporations as Public Servants.
Haines' Restrictive Railway Legislation.
Hamilton on Railroad Laws of New York.
Hamilton—Railway and Other Accidents.
Hamlin's Interstate Commerce Acts Indexed and Digested.
Hammond—Railway Rate Theories of the Interstate Commerce Commission.
Hardcastle on Statute Law.
Hatfield's Lectures on Commerce.
Hay, Jr.—The Law of Railway Accidents in Massachusetts.
Hayes—Public Utilities, Their Cost New and Depreciation.
Hemmeon—History of the British Post Office.
Henderson—Ditches and Water Courses.
Henderson on Locomotive Operation.
Hendrick on Railway Control by Commissions.
High on Injunctions.
Hitt—Electric Railway Dictionary.
Hodges on Railways.
Hodgins Dominion and Provincial Legislation.
Holmested and Langton—Ontario Judicature Act.
Holmested and Langton—Forms and Precedents.
Holt on Canadian Railway Law.
Hopkins—The Law of Personal Injuries.
Hough—Ocean Traffic and Trade.
Hudson on Compensation.
Hutchinson—Carriers.
Hutchinson on Carriers.

Idaho Public Utilities Commission Reports.
Illinois Railroad and Warehouse Commission Reports.
Illinois State Public Utilities Commission Report.
Imperial Statutes.
Index of Cases Reported in Law Reports.
Index to Interstate Commerce Commission Cases in the Federal Courts, 1887-1914. Division of Indices.
Indiana Railroad Commission Reports.
Interstate Commerce Commission. Express Rates, Practices and Accounts.
Interstate Commerce Commissian. Division of Statistics. A Preliminary Abstract of Statistics of Common Carriers, 1914.
Interstate Commerce Commission Reports.
Interstate Commerce Reports.
Ivatts—Railway Management.

Jackman—Freight Rates and Classifications, Express Service, Carriage by Water. (Interstate Commerce).
Jacobs' Railway Law of Canada.
Jevons—The State in Relation to Labour.
Johnson—American Railway Transportation.
Johnson—Ocean and Inland Water Transportation.
Johnson and Huebner—Railroad Traffic and Rates.
Jones—Fur Farming (Commission of Conservation).
Jones on Telegraph and Telephone Companies.
Joyce on Electric Law.
Judson on Interstate Commerce

LIST OF BOOKS IN LIBRARY UP TO MARCH 31, 1915—*Continued.*

Kansas Public Utilities Commission Reports.
Kent's Index to Cases Judicially Noticed in the Law Reports.
Keasbey on Electric Wires.
Kent's Digest of Decisions under the Federal Safety Appliance and Hours of Service Acts. 1915.
Kerr on Injunctions.
Kirkman—The Science of Railways.
Knoop on Principles and Methods of Municipal Trading.

Lafleur's Conflict of Laws.
Lake—Report Major-General Sir P. H. N. Lake.
Langelier—Cours de Droit Civil.
Langelier—De la Preuve.
Langstroth and Stilz—Railway Co-operation.
Larombiere.
Latimer on Railway Signalling in Theory and Practice.
Laurent's Droit Civil.
Law Times Reports. Index.
Leavitt—Forest Protection.
Lefroy's Legislative Power in Canada.
Legal News.
Leggett on Bills of Lading.
Lewis—American Railroad and Corporation Reports.
Lewis' Eminent Domain.
Lewis—Railway Signal Engineering.
Lewis' Sutherland on Statutory Construction.
Littré et Beaujeu—Dictionnaire de la Langue Française, avec un Supplément d'Histoire et de Géographie.
Los Angeles Public Utilities Board Reports.
Louisiana Railroad Commission Reports.
Lovell's Compendium.
Lovell's Gazetteer of the Dominion of Canada.
Lovell's Table of Routes.
Lower Canada Jurists.
Lower Canada Reports.
Lust and Merriam's Digest of Decisions under the Interstate Commerce Act.
Lyon on Capitalization. A Book on Corporation Finance.

MacBeth on the Rationale of Rates.
MacMillan and Gutches—Forest Products of Canada.
MacMurchy and Dennison's Canadian Railway Act Annotated.
MacMurchy and Dennison's Canadian Railway Cases.
MacMurchy and Dennison's Railway Law of Canada.
Macnamara's Law of Carriers.
Maine Commissioner of Highways Reports.
Manitoba Law Reports.
Manitoba Public Utilities Commission Reports.
Manitoba Statutes.
Mann—Massachusetts Railroad and Railway Laws.
Manual Railway and Signal Association.
Marriott—The Fixing of Rates and Fares.
Maryland Bureau of Statistics and Information.
Massachusetts Public Service Commission Reports.
Massachusetts Railroad Commissioners' Reports.
Masters' Supreme Court Practice.
Mathieu—Code Civil de la Province de Québec.
Mayne on Damages.
Maxwell on Statutes.
McDermot on Railways.
McLean—Georgian Bay Canal.
McNicol on American Telegraph Practice.
McPherson and Clarke's Law of Mines.
McPherson on Railroad Freight Rates in Relation to the Industry and Commerce of the United States.
McPherson—Transportation in Europe.
McPherson—The Working of the Railroads.
Merritt's Federal Regulation of Railway Rates.
Mews' Digest of English Case Law.
Meyer's British State Telegraphs.
Meyer's Government Regulation of Railway Rates.
Meyer on Municipal Ownership In Great Britain.

LIST OF BOOKS IN LIBRARY UP TO MARCH 31, 1915—*Continued.*

Meyer—Public Ownership and the Telephone in Great Britain.
Meyer's Railway Legislation in the United States.
Michigan Railroad Laws.
Michigan Commissioner of Railroads Reports.
Mignault.
Mills—Our Inland Seas, Their Shipping and Commerce for Three Centuries
Minnesota Railroad and Warehouse Commission Reports.
Mississippi Railroad Commissioners' Reports.
Missouri Railroad and Warehouse Commissioner's Reports.
Moulton—Waterways vs. Railways.
Montreal Directory.
Montreal Law Reports. Digest by Saint Cyr.
Montreal Street Railway Company's Annual Report.
Moody's Analyses of Railroad Investments.
Moody—How to Analyse Railroad Reports.
Moore on Carriers.
Morris—Railroad Administration.
Mossop's Railway Operating Statistics.
Mulvey's Canadian Company Law.
Murray's English Dictionary.

National Association of Railway Commissioners. Proceedings. Digest of Federal and State Court Decisions Interstate Commerce Laws, Interstate Commerce Act as amended.
Nebraska—Laws Relating to Railroads and other Common Carriers.
Nebraska State Railway Commission Reports.
Neilson and Twisaday—International Telegraph Convention of St. Petersburg, and the International Telegraph Service Regulations, Lisbon Revision, 1908.
Nellis on Street Railroad Accident Law.
Nellis on Street Service Railroads.
Nelson on The Anatomy of Railroad Reports.
Nelson—Interstate Commerce Commission.
Nevada Railroad Commission Reports.
Nevada Public Service Commission Reports.
New Brunswick Board of Commissioners of Public Utilities Report.
New Brunswick Equity Reports.
New Brunswick Reports.
New Brunswick Statutes.
Newcombe—Railway Economics.
Newcombe's Work of the Interstate Commerce Commission.
New Jersey Board of Public Utility Commissioners' Reports.
New Jersey Board of Railroad Commissioners' Reports.
New Hampshire Public Service Commission Reports.
New Hampshire Puhlic Service Classification of Accounts for Electric Utilities, 1914.
New Mexico State Corporation Commission Report.
New York Public Service Commission Reports, First and Second Districts.
New York Public Service Commission, Second District, Abstracts of Reports of Corporations Electrical, Gas, Telegraph, Telephone, Steam, 1913.
New York Railroad Commissioners' Reports.
Nichol—English Railway and Canal Cases.
North Carolina State Tax Commission Report.
North Dakota Board of Railroad Commissioners' Report.
North West Territories Ordinances.
Nouveau Dictionnaire, Anglais-Français et Français-Anglais.
Nova Scatia Judicature Act.
Nova Scotia Reports.
Nova Scotia Statutes.
Noyes' American Railroad Rates.
Nutt—Technological Dictionary, French, German, English.

O'Brien's Conveyancer.
Official Postal Guide of Canada.
Ohio Public Utilities Commission. Uniform Classification of Accounts for electric utilities, effective January 1915.
Oklahoma Corporation Commission Reports.
Ontario Digest Case Law. Supplement.
Ontario Gazetteer and Business Directory.
Ontario Law Reports. Index of Cases, 1905-1911.
Ontario Law Reports. Digest of Cases, 1882-1887.
Ontario Railway Digest.
Ontario Railway and Municipal Board Reports.

LIST OF BOOKS IN LIBRARY UP TO MARCH 31, 1915—*Continued.*

Ontario Reports.
Ontario Statutes.
Oregon Railroad Commission Reports.
Oregon Railroad Commission. Uniform Classification of Accounts for Electric Utilities, Gas Utilities, and Water Utilities.
Ottawa Directory.
Oxley's Light Railways.

Paine on The Law of Bailments.
Paish on The British Railway Position.
Parsons on the Heart of the Railroad Problem.
Parsons' Railway Companies and Passengers.
Patterson's Railway Accident Law.
Pease on The Freight Transportation of Trolley Lines.
Pennsylvania State Railroad Commission Reports.
Pennsylvania Public Service Commission Reports.
Pierce's Digest of Decisions under Act to Regulate Commerce.
Piggott's Imperial Statutes.
Pim—The Railways and the State.
Pollock's Bill of Lading Exceptions.
Pond on Public Utilities.
Poor's Manual of Railroads.
Postal Guide of Canada.
Pratt's American Railways.
Pratt's Canals and Traders.
Pratt on German vs. English Railways.
Pratt—A History of Inland Transport and Communication in England.
Pratt and MacKenzie on Highways.
Pratt—Railways and Their Rates.
Prentice—Federal Powers over Carriers and Corporations.
Prince Edward Island Reports.
Prince Edward Island Statutes.
Proctor—The Drainage Acts, 1908, Ontario, Manitoba, and British Columbia.

Quebec Law Reports.
Quebec Official Reports.
Quebec Public Utilities' Commission Reports.
Quebec Statutes.

Ripley—Railroads. Finance and Organization.
Railways and Canals Reports.
Railway Commission Reports.
Railway Signal Association Manual.
Railway Signal Association Proceedings.
Railway Statistics of Canada.
Railway Statistics of the United States.
Railways in the United States.
Ramsay's Appeal Cases.
Ramsay and Morin Reports.
Rapalje's Digest of American Decisions and Reports.
Rapalje and Mack's Digest of Railway Law.
Raper on Railway Transportation.
Rapports Judiciaires Officiels de Québec.
Ray's Negligence of Imposed Duties, Passenger Carriers, Freight Carriers.
Redfield on The Law of Railways.
Redman's Arbitration and Awards.
Redman's Law of Railway Carriers.
Reeder—The Validity of Rate Regulations State and Federal.
Reese on Ultra Vires.
Revue de Jurisprudence.
Revue Légale.
Revue Trimestrielle Canadienne, 1915.
Rhode Island Public Utilities Commission Reports.
Richards—Conservation of Men.
Richardson & Hook—American Street Railway Decisions.
Richards and Soper on Compensation.
Ripley—The Railroads and the People.
Ripley—Railroads, Rates and Regulations.
Ripley—Railway Problems.
Robertson on Tramways.

LIST OF BOOKS IN LIBRARY UP TO MARCH 31, 1915—*Continued.*

Robinson and Joseph's Law and Equity Digest.
Roscoe's Nisi Prius.
Ross on British Railways.
Rover on Railroads.
Royal Commission on Industrial Training and Technical Education, Report of the Commissioners.
Russell on Arbitration.
Russell and Bayley—Indian Railways Act, 1890
Russell's Equity Decisions of Nova Scotia.

Saskatchewan Reports.
Saskatchewan Statutes.
Sayings and Writing about the Railways.
Schouler's Bailments and Carriers.
Scott—Automatic Block Signals.
Scott's Law of Telegraphs.
Scrutton—Charterparties and Bills of Lading.
Sea Fisheries of Eastern Canada (Commission of Conservation).
Sellew—Steel Rails, Their History, Properties, Strength and Manufacture.
Seton on Decrees.
Shaughnessy Before the Interstate Commerce Commission, Long and Short Haul Provisions.
Shelton—The Lakes-to-the-Gulf Deep Waterway.
Sirey's Code Civil.
Smith's Organization of Ocean Commerce.
Snyder's American Railways as Investments.
Snyder's Annotated Interstate Commerce Act and Federal Anti-Trust Laws.
Sourdat.
South Carolina Railroad Commission Reports.
South Dakota Railroad Commissioner's Reports.
Stafford—The Canadian Oyster—Commission of Conservation Report.
Statistics of Common Carriers. Interstate Commerce Commission.
Statistics of Telegraph Companies in Canada.
Statistics of Telephones in the Dominion of Canada.
Statuts du Canada.
Statuts de Québec.
Statutes relating to the City of Toronto, 1894.
Stephens' Digest of Highway Cases.
Stephen's Quebec Digest.
Sterne—Railways in the United States.
Steven's Digest of N.B. Reports.
Stewart's Index to Dominion and Provincial Statutes.
Stickney on The Railway Problem.
Streets' Foundations of Legal Liability.
Strombeck—Freight Classification.
Stroud's Judicial Dictionary.
Suffern and Son—Railroad Operating Costs.
Supreme Court Reports.
Sutherland on Damages.

Talbot—The Making of a Great Canadian Railway.
Talbot and Fort's English Cltations.
Talbot's Railway Conquest of the World.
Taschereau—The Criminal Code.
Taschеau's Thèse du Cas Fortuit.
Taylor on Evidence.
Telephone Cases.
Temiskaming and Northern Ontario Railway Commission Reports.
Temp. Wood's Manitoba Reports.
Territories Law Reports.
Texas Railroad Commission Reports.
La Thémis.
Theoret's Catalogue of Law Books Published in Canada, Great Britain, France, and United States.
Theoret's Code de Procédure Civile, Montreal.
Thiess and Joy's Toll Telephone Practice.
Thompson's Law of Electricity.
Thornton's Railroad Fences and Private Crossings.
Tiedman's Municipal Corporations in the United States.
Toronto Directory.

LIST OF BOOKS IN LIBRARY UP TO MARCH 31, 1915—*Concluded.*

United States Supreme Court Reports. Digest.
Union Switch and Signal Company, Swissvale, Pa. Electric Train Staff Catalogue.

Van Zile—Bailments and Carriers.
Vaughan's Index to the Railway Acts of Canada.
Vermont Public Service Commission Reports.
Vermont's Public Service Laws compiled from the public Statutes and the Acts of the General Assembly at the Sessions of 1908 and 1910.
Virginia State Corporation Commission Reports.

Waghorn—Traders and Railways.
Washington Progress and Prosperity.
Washington State Public Service Commission Reports.
Webb's Economics of Railroad Construction.
Weir's Assessment Law of Canada.
Weld's Private Freight Cars and American Railways.
Wellington—The Economic Theory of Railways.
Wellington's Economical Theory of Railway Location.
Weyl's Passenger Traffic of Railways.
Whitaker's Almanac.
Whitten's Valuation of Public Service Corporations.
Wigmore on Evidence.
Wilson—Mechanical Railway Signalling.
Wilson—Power Railway Signalling.
Wilson—Safety of British Railways.
Wisconsin Railroad Commission Reports.
Wood's Railway Law.
Woodfall's Railway and Canal Traffic.
Woodlock—Anatomy of Railroad Reports.
Words and Phrases Judicially Defined.
Wright's Locomotive Dictionary.
Wyer's Regulation, Valuation and Depreciation of Public Utilities.
Wyman on Public Service Corporations.

Young's Admiralty Nova Scotia Reports.
Yukon Territory Ordinances

APPENDIX "J."

List of applications subdivided under sections of the Act.

THE BOARD OF RAILWAY COMMISSIONERS FOR CANADA.

RECORD ROOM.

STATEMENT showing applications made to the Board under the various Sections of the Railway Act, for the Fiscal Year ending March 31, 1915.

Sections of Railway Act.	1914.									1915.			Totals.
	April.	May.	June.	July.	Aug.	Sept.	Oct.	Nov.	Dec.	Jan.	Feb.	Mar.	
Rescinding of Orders, Sec. 29	5	3	2	5	1	4	3	3	4	4	2	12	48
Rules and Regulations, Secs. 30, 2o9, 367, 313		1		1									2
Extension of time, Sec. 50	1	2		8		6	4	5	1			1	28
Location of line, Secs. 157, 158	3	4	7	3	3	2		1	2	7	2	3	37
Route Map, Sec. 157	1	4		3	3		1				2	1	15
Correction Plans, Sec. 162		1							2	1			4
Railway as constructed, Sec. 164	3	1	4		7	2	5	3	2	2	2	3	34
Deviation of line, Sec. 167	5	6	5	9	6	6	8	3	1	2	4	3	58
Expropriation of lands, Secs. 172, 191	19	5	2	4	2	2	3	2	2	2	1		44
Appeals to Supreme Court							1	1					2
Branch lines of Railway, Secs. 221, 266	32	38	34	34	22	21	23	18	11	10	10	14	267
Railway Crossings and Junctions, Secs. 227, 229	8	6	13	14	14	9	7	8	7	3	1	4	94
Interlocking Appliances, Sec. 227		5	1	1		3	2	2	2		1	6	23
Highway Crossings, Secs. 235, 243	72	52	29	63	41	32	25	21	13	21	19	4	392
Highway Diversion, Sec. 237	11	6	4	5	4	2	5	6	3	8	2	1	57
Protection at Crossings, Sec. 243	12	3	13	28	15	6	7	7	3	8	10	12	124
Telegraph and Telephone Lines, Sec. 244			2				1						3
Telegraph and Telephone Connections, Sec. 245	2	3	2							1	1		9
Telegraph Wire Crossings, Sec. 246								1		1		1	3
Telephone Wire Crossings, Sec. 246	1	1			1							11	14
Power Wire Crossings, Sec. 246	1	1	1	2	2		2	11	13	2	2		37
Telephone Agreement, Sec. 248		3	3	3	3	5	2	4		6	9	10	48
Water Pipes, Sec. 250	2											1	3
Sewers, Sec. 250			2	8	5	2	1	3	3	1	1	1	27
Culverts, Sec. 250	2	1			2	1	1			1		3	11
Farm Crossings, Secs. 252, 263	1	2	4	3	8	5	2	2	2	2	5	4	40
Cattleguards, Secs. 254, 255			2	3	1	1	3			1			11

Fencing of Right of Way, Sec. 254	1	1	3	4	7	2	8	3	1	1			31
Construction on Nav. Waters, Sec. 233		1			2	3	1						7
Bridges, Secs. 256, 257	11	15	36	37	16	4	11	3	8	17	4	2	164
Tunnels, Secs. 256, 257			1	2									3
Stations, Sec. 258	7	12	12	12	5	30	22	9	2	16	14	9	150
Condition of Stations, Sec. 258	1			1									2
Station Accommodation and Agents	2	4	3	7	2	1	3	5	49	14	4	11	105
Condition of Round-houses							1		1				2
Opening of Railway, Sec. 261	3	74	15	22	9	9	17	10	9		2	1	171
Condition of Railway, Sec. 262	2	1	2	1	10	5	4	1	2	6	6	3	46
Rolling Stock, Secs. 264, 268		1	1			1	1			2		1	7
Train Service	4	3	3	4	3	1	3	2	5		6	4	38
Working of Trains, Sec. 269		1	1	1	1					3	1		8
Obstruction to Traffic, Sec. 279	2		2	3	1		1	3				1	13
Accommodation for Traffic, Sec. 284	6	6	1	3	2	2	2		1	1	4	2	30
Accident Reports, Secs. 292,	45	12	21	15	14	12	31	25	35	33	21	19	283
Thistles and Woods, Sec. 296	14				1	3	3		1				22
Fires from Locomotives, Secs. 297, 298			2	1			1		3			1	8
By-Laws *re* Tolls, Sec. 314	2		1			1	1	1			1		7
Discrimination Facilities, Sec. 317			1								1		2
Interswitching, Secs. 317, 334		1	5	7	2	2	2	3	2			2	26
Freight Classification, Sec. 321	2		2				1		3	3		18	29
Standard Freight Tariffs, Sec. 327		3	5	1	3	3		1	1	1	4	1	23
Standard Passenger Tariffs, Sec. 351					1			2		1		1	5
Local Freight Tariffs											1		1
Local Passenger Tariffs					1		1	1	1				4
Adjustment in Rates	1		2									3	6
Special Tariffs, Secs. 329, 332	2	1		4		1	1	1	5	1	4	3	23
Provision for Carriage, Secs. 340, 342	1		1							1		3	6
Express Tolls, Secs. 348, 354							2						2
Carriage by Express, Sec. 352		2	1	1		1	1	2	3	1	1	3	16
Telephone Tolls, Secs. 355, 360	1									1		1	3
Amalgamation Agreements, Secs. 361, 363								3	1	2			6
Enquiries	22	33	24	38	16	21	27	20	28	31	10	12	282
Requests	4	15	20	10	8	10	12	4	9	18	10	22	142
Complaints	74	66	61	71	47	52	54	71	71	67	70	92	796
Miscellaneous	9	19	11	14	8	6	12	12	12	10	7	8	128
General Orders of the Board	1	2		5			1		1	1		4	15
Totals	398	424	367	461	299	279	330	283	325	314	245	322	4,047

OTTAWA, April 16, 1915.

(Sgd.) F. R. DEMERS,
Statistical Clerk—Records.

APPENDIX "K".

THE BOARD OF RAILWAY COMMISSIONERS FOR CANADA.

RECORD ROOM.

List of cases appealed to the Supreme Court of Canada, February 1, 1904, to March 31, 1915.

File No. 1114.—Montreal Terminal Railway *v.* Montreal Street Railway, Pius IX Avenue Crossing. Appeal from Order of Deputy Chief Commissioner and Commissioner Mills on question of jurisdiction. Appeal allowed.

File No. 1492.—James Bay Railway *v.* Grand Trunk Railway-Crossing Belt Line spur. Appeal on question of law. Appeal dismissed.

File No. 383.—Canada Atlantic Railway, Ottawa Electric Railway and city of Ottawa, *re* Bank street subway. Appeal of the Ottawa Electric Railway on question of law. Appeal dismissed.

File No. 588.—*Re* Toronto Union station. A. R. Williams expropriation. Appeal to Supreme Court and then to Privy Council, England, on question of jurisdiction. Appeal dismissed.

File No. 1604.—Case No. 1309.—Robinson *v.* Grand Trunk Railway, two-cent rate. Appeal to the Supreme Court and then to the Privy Council, on question of law. Appeal dismissed.

File No. 689.—Canadian Pacific Railway Company *v.* Grand Trunk Railway *re* branch line, London, Ont., Grand Trunk Railway. Appeal on question of jurisdiction. Appeal dismissed.

File No. 1680.—Essex Terminal and W. E. and L. S. railroad crossing, township of Sandwich. Appeal by the Essex Terminal Railway on question of law. Appeal dismissed.

File No. 1497.—T. D. Robinson and Canadian Northern Railway spur at Winnipeg. Appeal by the Canadian Northern Railway Company on question of jurisdiction. Appeal dismissed.

File No. 9527.—Montreal Street Railway *re* rates Montreal Royal ward. Appeal by the Montreal Street Railway Company on question of jurisdiction. Appeal allowed.

Case No. 4719.—*Re* Agriculture Department, province of Ontario, and Grand Trunk Railway Company, station at Vineland. Appeal by the railway company on question of jurisdiction. Appeal dismissed.

Case No. 3322.—*Re* Toronto viaduct. Appeal by the Canadian Pacific Railway Company on question of law. Appeal dismissed.

Case No. 4813.—*Re* fencing and cattleguards. Order No. 7473. Appeal by the Canadian Northern Railway Company on question of jurisdiction. Appeal allowed in part.

Case No. 4492.—City of Toronto and Grand Trunk Railway and Canadian Pacific Railway Companies, *re* commutation tickets. Stated case to the Supreme Court by the city of Toronto on question of law.

Case No. 3545.—*Re* city of Ottawa and county of Carleton, Richmond road viaduct. Appeal by the county of Carleton on question of jurisdiction. Appeal dismissed.

File No. 13079.—Grand Trunk Railway and Canadian Northern Ontario Railway spur, township of Scarboro. Appeal by the Grand Trunk Railway Company on question of jurisdiction. Appeal dismissed.

Case No. 3269.—Grand Trunk Railway and British American Oil Companies, oil rates. Appeal by the Grand Trunk Railway Company on question of law. Appeal dismissed.

File No. 1519.—Grand Trunk Pacific Railway and Fort William, *re* location. Appeal by the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway on question of jurisdiction. Appeal dismissed.

File No. 11965.—Niagara, St. Catharines and Toronto Railway and Davy. Appeal by the Niagara, St. Catharines and Toronto Railway Company on question of jurisdiction. Appeal allowed.

File No. 9527.—Montreal Street Railway *re* rates, Mount Royal ward. Appeal by the Montreal, Park and Island Railway on question of jurisdiction. Appeal allowed.

File No. 10912.—Application of the Canadian Northern Railway Company to cross certain streets in city of Prince Albert, Sask., and Chas. Macdonald. Not yet heard.

File No. 15580.—Clover Bar Coal Company, Limited, and Wm. Humberstone. The Grand Trunk Pacific Railway Company and the Clover Bar Sand and Gravel Company. Appeal allowed.

File No. 16282.—Regina rate case. Appeal dismissed.

File No. 1487.—Application of E. F. Chambers and W. R. G. Phair in connection with Order of the Board No. 544, dated July 13, 1905, *re* Canadian Pacific Railway location, Molson-St. Boniface branch. Leave to appeal granted.

File No. 17963.—Application of the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway Company for leave to appeal from Judgment of the Board in regard to complaint of A. E. Purcell of Saskatoon, Sask. Appeal dismissed with costs, Judgment being confined to the particular circumstances at Saskatoon.

Case No. 3269.—Application of the Canadian Pacific Railway Company for leave to appeal from Judgment of the Board on question of law, in regard to the British American Oil Company's case. Appeal dismissed with costs.

File No. 15330—15330·1.—Application of the Grand Trunk and Canadian Pacific Railway Companies for leave to appeal upon the question of jurisdiction of the Board, in regard to Order dated May 16, 1911, *re* Canadian Oil Company. Appeal dismissed with costs.

File No. 19435.—Application of the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway Company for leave to appeal from Order No. 16701 of the Board, dated June 4, 1912, authorizing the city of Edmonton to cross with tracks and wires, etc., of its municipality-owned electric street railway, the tracks of the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway Company at 21st street, Edmonton. Appeal dismissed.

File No. 14329·9.—Montreal, Park and Island Railway Company and Montreal Tramways Company, for leave to appeal against Order of the Board No. 17082, dated July 20, 1912, allowing the Lachine, Jacques Cartier and Maisonneuve Railway Company to expropriate lands of the Montreal, Park and Island Railway Company. Still pending.

File No. 20062.—Application of the British Columbia Electric Railway Company from Order of the Board No. 17480, dated October 14, 1912, authorizing the city of Vancouver to construct Hastings, Pender, Keefer and Harris streets across the tracks of the Vancouver Victoria and Eastern Railway and Navigation Company, in the city of Vancouver, B.C., Appeal granted.

SUMMARY.

Number of cases in which appeal was dismissed	18
Number of cases in which appeal was allowed	8
Number of cases still pending	3
Total number of cases appealed	29

LIST OF APPEALS TO THE GOVERNOR IN COUNCIL FROM FEBRUARY 1, 1904 TO MARCH 31, 1915.

File No. 399.—Bay of Quinte railway, crossing Canadian Pacific Railway Company at Tweed, Ont. Appeal to the Governor in Council by the Bay of Quinte Railway Company. Order of the Board set aside and former Order of the railway committee confirmed.

File No. 1455.—James Bay Railway *v.* Grand Trunk Railway Companies, crossing near Beaverton. Appeal of the James Bay Railway Company. Appeal dismissed.

File No. 1780.—*Re* Chatham Street Crossings, Grand Trunk Railway Company. Appeal by the Grand Trunk Railway Company. Appeal dismissed.

File No. 12992.—*Re* Maniwaki Branch of Canadian Pacific Railway Company, starting of trains from Ottawa. Appeal allowed and Case referred back to Board.

File No. 2030.—*Re* Tariffs of certain Yukon Railway. (This was not included in the report.)

File No. 12912.—Park Avenue Subway, town of St. Louis, Montreal, and Canadian Pacific Railway Company. Appeal dismissed in part.

File No. 3452-30.—Application of J. Y. Rochester *re* Cameron Bay and Grand Trunk Pacific Railway Company. Appeal dismissed.

File No. 17040.—Lambton to Western Spur and Canadian Pacific Railway Company. Appeal still pending.

File No. 17716.—Canadian Pacific Railway Company spur (Longue Pointe) through town of Maisonneuve, Que. Appeal dismissed.

File No. 18849—18787.—South Hazelton townsite and Grand Trunk Pacific Railway Company. Appeal allowed.

Case No. 3322.—Toronto Viaduct Case. Appeal dismissed.

File No. 9437-153—12021-70.—Appeal of the Corporation of the city of Toronto from two Orders of the Board, dated June 25, 1912, and numbered respectively, 16842 and 16846 and in the matter of the North Toronto Grade Separation. Yonge street subway. Appeal dismissed.

File No. 19024.—Appeal of Chas. Miller of Toronto, Ont., from the order of the board, dated 14th day of May, 1913, in the matter of the application of the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway Company for approval of the location of the company's station at Prince George, B.C. Appeal dismissed.

File No. 16177.—Appeal of the Canadian Pacific Railway Company from the Order of the Board dated 19th day of February, 1913, in the matter of the application of the Mountain Lumber Manufacturers' Association regarding lumber rates. Appeal withdrawn.

SUMMARY.

No. of cases in which appeal was dismissed	9
No. of cases in which appeal was allowed	3
No. of cases still pending	2
Total No. of cases appealed	14

APPENDIX "L."

List of General Orders and Circulars of the Board for the Year Ending March 31, 1915.

General Order No.	Date.	Subject.
124	April 30th, 1914	Draw, or swing, or Bascule bridges over navigable waters.
125	May 30th, 1914	Western freight rates.
126	May 28th, 1914	Fire reports declared privileged.
127	July 6th, 1914	Marker lights on carbooses.
128	July 20th, 1914	Safety appliances, rules and regulations.
129	July 22nd, 1914	Increased special and competitve freight and express tolls, and suspensions thereof.
130	July 28th, 1914	Tariffs for the exclusive use of drawing rooms or compartments in sleeping and parlor cars.
131	July 6th, 1914	Locomotive defects.
132	October 2nd, 1914	Restoring mixing privileges in connection with car-loads of groceries, dried fruit, and liquors from Eastern Canada points to Western Canada.
133	December 19th, 1914	Suspending proposed cancellation *re* mixed car-loads of groceries, dried fruit, and liquors from Eastern Canada points.
134	January 25th, 1915	Amendment of the standard regulations *re* tariff for new lines opening for traffic.
135	March 22nd, 1915	Rates of freight on news-print paper.
136	March 25th, 1915	Form of "release" for carriage of household goods.
137	March 26th, 1915	Amendment to express classification for Canada No. 3.
Circular No.		
133	May 5th, 1914	*Re* fire reports.
134	May 26th, 1914	Working time tables.
135	August 21st, 1914	Increased tolls for exclusive use of drawing rooms or compartments in sleeping and parlor cars.
136	October 17th, 1914	Interpretation of section 4 of order No. 12225 (General Order No. 65), *re* conductors for light engines.
137	December 2nd, 1914	Operation of crossing plants at crossings between steam and electric railways.
138	December 19th, 1914	Changes in time-tables.
139	January 13th, 1915	Changes in train time.
140	January 22nd, 1915	Inspection of locomotive boilers.
141 (Sup. No. 1.)	January 25th, 1915	Spark arresting devise for use on locomotives burning non-coking coal.
141	February 16th, 1915	Spark arresting device for use on locomotives burning non-coking coal.

GENERAL ORDER No. 124.

In the matter of the operation by railway companies subject to the jurisdiction of the board, of draw, or swing, or bascule bridges over navigable waters; and the question of regulations governing the operation. (File No. 10291.)

Upon reading the regulations governing such operation of draw, or swing, bridges over navigable waters other than railway bridges, approved by Order in council dated the 29th of June, 1910, the submissions on behalf of the Department of Marine and Fisheries, and the report and recommendation of the chief engineer of the board; and in pursuance of the powers conferred upon the board under sections 30 and 232 of the Railway Act, and of all other powers possessed by it in that behalf—

It is ordered that the regulations to govern the operation by railway companies within the legislative authority of the Parliament of Canada, of draw, or swing, or bascule bridges over navigable waters, following, be, and they are hereby, approved, namely:

1. Every swing or draw bridge over a navigable water shall be marked at night by a white light on each side of the navigable channel, by white light on each end of the swing protection, and by a lantern surmounting the swing span showing a red light up and down the channel when the passage is closed, and green when the swing is open.

2. In the case of a bascule bridge of any description, it will suffice that a light showing green up or down a channel when the leaf or leaves are lifted, and red when the bridge is closed, be shown from one side or the other of the opening, or, preferably, carried on the end of the leaf. The white lights above described for a swing bridge also to be maintained.

3. The signal to be given by a steamer to have a swing opened shall be two long followed by two short blasts of the whistle.

4. Every swing or draw shall, whenever it is desired to have a vessel pass through the bridge, be in charge of some competent person present thereat, whose duty it shall be, upon being notified by whistle or in any other manner, that a vessel desires to pass through the bridge, to open the same as promptly as possible; and no such vessel shall pass through the bridge until the swing or draw is fully open.

5. Where, as in the case of the Canadian Northern Railway bridge over the Red river at Winnipeg and the freight bridge of the same railway over the Assiniboine river at Winnipeg, traffic is so slight that a bridge is required to be opened not more than once or twice a year, the lights provided for under clauses 1 and 2 of this order are required to be lit at night only when a vessel desires to pass through the swing or draw.

6. The Fraser River bridge, covered by order of the board No. 18626, dated February 6, 1913, and any other bridge covered by special order of the board whose terms differ from this order, shall be exempt from the provisions herein.

(Signed) H. L. DRAYTON,

Chief Commissioner,

Board of Railway Commissioners for Canada.

OTTAWA, April 30, 1914.

GENERAL ORDER No. 125.

In the matter of the complaint of the Vancouver Board of Trade alleging discrimination in freight rates by the railway companies operating in the province of British Columbia; and the consideration of the matter of rates for the carriage of freight traffic upon railway lines in Canada west of Port Arthur, Ontario. (File No. 18755.)

Upon the hearing of the matter at various sittings of the board held in the presence of counsel for, and representatives of, the railway companies affected, the Dominion Government, the Governments of the provinces of Saskatchewan, Alberta, and British Columbia, the city of Winnipeg and the Winnipeg Board of Trade, the city of St. Boniface and the St. Boniface Board of Trade, the United Farmers of Alberta, the Canadain Manufacturers' Association, and the Boards of Trade of Montreal, Toronto, Portage la Prairie, Brandon, Regina, Moosejaw, Saskatoon, Prince Albert, North Battleford, Edmonton, Medicine Hat, Calgary, Lethbridge, Nelson, Vancouver, and Victoria, the evidence adduced, and what was alleged, judgment, dated

April 6, 1914, was delivered by the Chief Commissioner and concurred in by the other members of the board, a certified copy of the said judgment being attached hereto marked "A."—

It is ordered that the terms of the judgment, which is hereby made part of this order, and the tariff changes therein directed to be made, be complied with and become effective not later than 1st day of September, 1914.

And it is further ordered that, for a period of two years from the date of this order, no rates at present in effect west of Port Arthur, Ontario, be increased without the approval of the board.

(Signed) D'ARCY SCOTT,

Assistant Chief Commissioner.

Board of Railway Commissioners for Canada.

OTTAWA, May 30, 1914.

GENERAL ORDER No. 126.

Whereas by circular of the Board No. 133, dated May 5, 1914, railway companies subject to the jurisdiction of the board were required to submit monthly, in duplicate, reports on fires originating within three hundred feet of the track and burning over an area of one hundred square feet or more outside the right of way.

And whereas application has been made on behalf of the Grand Trunk Railway Company for a declaration by the board that all reports submitted in accordance with the said Circular No. 133 be treated as privileged, not open to the inspection of the public generally, nor copies given to applicants therefor. (File 4741-F, Part 2.)

Upon the reading of what is filed in support of the application—

The Board doth order that the report or reports submitted by Railway Companies in accordance with the said Circular of the Board No. 133, be, and the same is and are, hereby declared to be privileged, and shall only be made public or given out upon application therefor by order of the Board.

(Sgd.) D'ARCY SCOTT,

Assistant Chief Commissioner,

Board of Railway Commissioners for Canada.

OTTAWA, May 28, 1914.

GENERAL ORDER No. 127.

In the matter of the putting up and taking down of marker lights on cabooses, and Circular No. 130, dated March 11, 1914, submitted to the railway companies subject to the jurisdiction of the Board. (File No. 13455.2.)

Upon the reading of the replies to the said circular filed by the railway companies, and the report of the Chief Operating Officer of the Board, certain of the railway companies consenting to the adoption of the regulations particularly set out in this order regarding the putting up and taking down of marker lights on cabooses; and in pursuance of the powers conferred upon it by Sections 30 and 269 of the Railway Act, and of all other powers possessed by the Board in that behalf—

It is ordered that cabooses of all railway companies subject to the jurisdiction of the Board be equipped as follows, namely:—

1. Where cabooses are equipped with marker sockets in the lower position, markers shall be carried in such lower sockets.

2. All cabooses hereafter constructed shall be equipped with marker sockets in the lower position.

3. All cabooses now in use not equipped with marker sockets in the lower position, shall be so equipped on or before the 1st day of November, 1914.

(Sgd.) H. L. DRAYTON,

Chief Commissioner,

Board of Railway Commissioners for Canada.

Ottawa, July 6, 1914.

GENERAL ORDER No. 128.

In the matter of the General Order of the Board No. 102, dated February 17, 1913, prescribing Rules and Regulations respecting Safety Appliances on trains of railway companies subject to the jurisdiction of the board. (File No. 11654.)

Upon the report and recommendation of the Chief Operating Officer of the Board, and the reading of what is filed on behalf of the Canadian Pacific Railway Company—

It is ordered that railway companies subject to the jurisdiction of the board be, and they are hereby, granted an extension of time until the 1st day of July, 1916, within which to make the following changes, namely:

(a) To change the location of brakes on all cars to comply with the standard prescribed in the Regulations of the Board, dated February 17, 1913.

(b) To comply with the standard prescribed in the said regulations in respect to all brake specifications contained therein.

(c) To change cars having less than ten inches end ladder clearance within thirty inches of the side of the car, to comply with the said regulations.

(d) To comply with the standard prescribed in the said regulations in respect to hand holds, running boards, ladders, sill steps, and brake staffs, except that when a car is shopped for work amounting practically to rebuilding body of car, it must then be equipped according to standards prescribed in the said regulations.

And it is further ordered that railway companies subject to the jurisdiction of the board be not required to make changes to secure additional end ladder clearance on cars that have ten or more inches end ladder clearance within thirty inches of side of car, or to make the changes in end ladders, side ladders, hand grips and steps which have been made in accordance with the provisions of section 264 of the Railway Act and the General Order of the Board No. 102, or to comply with the regulations of the board aforesaid, until the car is shopped for work amounting to practically rebuilding body of car, at which time such changes must be made to comply with the standards prescribed in the said order.

And it is further ordered that railway companies be not required to change the location of hand holes (except end hand holes under end sills), ladders, sill steps, brake wheels, and brake staffs, on freight train cars where the appliances are within three inches of the required location, except that when cars undergo regular repairs they must then be made to comply with the standards prescribed in the said regulations.

(Sgd.) H. L. DRAYTON,

Chief Commissioner.

Board of Railway Commissioners for Canada.

Ottawa, July 20, 1914.

GENERAL ORDER No. 129.

In the matter of increased special and competitive freight and express tolls, and suspensions thereof. (File No. 24318.)

In pursuance of the powers conferred upon the board by sections 26 and 348 of the Railway Act, and of all other powers possessed by it in that behalf:

Upon the recommendation of the Chief Traffic Officer of the board—

It is ordered as follows, namely:

1. No toll contained in any special or competitive freight or express tariff referred to in subsections 3 and 4 of section 326, and subsection 2 of section 348 of the Railway Act, shall be advanced until it has been in force for at least thirty days:

Provided that when a special or competitive freight or express tariff contains a notice that any reduced toll shown therein will expire upon a given date, which date shall not be less than thirty days from the date upon which the said reduced toll becomes effective, the said notice shall be considered to comply with subsection 3 of section 328 of the Railway Act, as amended by section 11, 1-2 George V, chapter 22.

2. Except of its own motion, or on special grounds advanced, the board will not ordinarily suspend, or postpone the effective date, of any tariff, or any supplement to a tariff, or any particular rate, or rule, or regulation of the carriers subject to its jurisdiction, which directly, or in effect, increases the charge to be paid for the same similar service, unless an application for suspension, or postponement, is received by the board at least fourteen days before the date when the charge complained against is published to become effective; such application to give the "C.R.C." number of the schedule, and the items thereof complained against.

(Signed) D'ARCY SCOTT,

Assistant Chief Commissioner,

Board of Railway Commissioners for Canada.

OTTAWA, July 22, 1914.

GENERAL ORDER No. 130.

In the matter of the tariffs filed by certain railway companies, requiring additional railway tickets for the exclusive use of drawing rooms or compartments in sleeping and parlour cars; and the Order of the Board No. 21413, dated February 27, 1914, suspending the said tariffs pending investigation by the Board. (File No. 9451.)

Upon the hearing of the matter at the sittings of the Board held in Ottawa, March 17, 1914, in the presence of Counsel for the Canadian Pacific, Grand Trunk, Ottawa and New York, and Canadian Northern Railway Companies and the Michigan Central Railroad Company, and what was alleged—

It is ordered that the following schedules, in so far as their purpose is to increase the tolls previously charged for the said accommodations locally between points both of which are in Canada, be, and they are hereby, disallowed, namely:

Boston and Maine Railroad Company's Tariff, C.R.C. No. 233.
Canadian Pacific Railway Company's Tariff, C.R.C. No. E-2410.
Canadian Pacific Railway Company's Tariff, C.R.C. No. W-1592.
Central Vermont Railway Company's Tariff, C.R.C. No. 378.
Grand Trunk Railway Company's Tariff, C.R.C. No. E-1989.
Grand Trunk Pacific Railway Company's Tariff, C.R.C. No. 317.
Great Northern Railway Company's Supplement No. 9 to Tariff C.R.C. No. S-3.

Main Central Railroad Company's Tariff, C.R.C. No. 158.
Michigan Central Railroad Company's Tariff, C.R.C. No. 1895.
Rutland Railroad Company's Tariff, C.R.C., No. 525.
New York Central and Hudson River Railroad Company's Tariff, C.R.C. No. 820.
Toronto, Hamilton and Buffalo Railway Company's Tariff, C.R.C. No. 935.
Wabash Railroad Company's Tariff, C.R.C. No. 818 and Supplement No. 1 thereto.

And it is further ordered that, on the receipt of this Order, the said companies forthwith and by lawful notice publish and file schedules giving effect thereto.

(Sgd.) D'ARCY SCOTT,

Assistant Chief Commissioner,
Board of Railway Commissioners for Canada

Ottawa, July 28, 1914.

GENERAL ORDER No. 131.

In the matter of locomotive defects, and Circular No. 127, dated February 24, 1914, submitted by direction of the board to railway companies under its jurisdiction for their consideration and report.

(File No. 21351.)

Upon the reading of the replies to the said circular, filed by the railway companies, and the reports of the operating officers of the board, the railway companies, after various meetings and discussions, consenting to the adoption of the regulations particularly set out in this order regarding locomotive defects; and in pursuance of the powers conferred upon it by sections 30 and 269 of the Railway Act, and of all other powers possessed by the board in that behalf—

It is ordered that the locomotive engines of railway companies subject to the jurisdiction of the board be not allowed to leave terminals, or to be used at terminals in traffic service, on which any of the following defects exist, namely:—

1. *Steam leaks.*—Steam leaks from any part of the locomotive which render it impossible for engineer to see signals in sufficient time to enable him to bring his train to a stop within the required distance.

2. *Air brakes.*—Air brakes on locomotives or tenders not in serviceable condition.

3. *Wheel defects.*—Locomotives with steel or steel-tired leading engine truck wheels, leading or trailing driving wheels, or tender wheels with flanges worn $\frac{1}{16}$ below M.C.B. wheel defect gauge for cars of less than 80,000 pounds capacity.

Locomotives with cast-iron engine truck wheels and cast-iron wheels under tender weighing over 130,000 pounds, with flanges worn $\frac{1}{16}$ below M.C.B. defect gauge for cars of 80,000 pounds capacity, or over.

Locomotives with cast-iron wheels under tender weighing 130,000 pounds, or less, with flanges worn $\frac{1}{16}$ below M.C.B. defect gauge for cars of less than 80,000 pounds capacity.

Locomotives with truck or tender wheels having shelled out or flat spots over $2\frac{1}{2}$ inches long, or so numerous as to endanger the safety of the wheel.

Steel tires on locomotives worn hollow $\frac{3}{8}$ inch in depth, or which are worn below safe limit of thickness. Railway companies to file with the board their standard limit of thickness of tires on all classes of locomotives, for approval.

Flat or shelled out spots on locomotive driving wheels 3 inches long.

4. *Springs.*—Locomotives with defective springs on any part of locomotive or tender which are unable to carry their respective weights when locomotive is standing.

And it is further ordered that the said railway companies be, and they are hereby required, on or before the first day of January, 1915, to equip their locomotives with double windows in the front of the cabs during the winter season, November 1 to April 30; the same to be made air-tight.

D'ARCY SCOTT.

Assistant Chief Commissioner,
Board of Railway Commissioners for Canada.

OTTAWA, July 6, 1914.

GENERAL ORDER No. 132.

In the matter of the complaints of the Montreal, Toronto, Hamilton and Edmonton Boards of Trade, the Shippers' Section of the Winnipeg Board of Trade, the Ontario Wholesale Grocers' Guild, the British Columbia Wholesale Grocers' Exchange, the Retail Merchants' Association of Canada (Saskatchewan Provincial Board), the Wholesale Grocers of Regina, the Dominion Wholesale Grocers' Guild, and Balfour, Smye & Company, against the cancellation of mixing privileges in connection with carloads of groceries, dried fruit, and liquors from Eastern Canada points to points in Western Canada. (File No. 18755-21.)

Upon the hearing of the matter at the sittings of the board held in Montreal, September 24, 1914, in the presence of counsel for the Canadian Northern, Grand Trunk, Grand Trunk Pacific, and Canadian Pacific Railway Companies, the Montreal and Toronto Boards of Trade, the Montreal Liquor Association, Balfour, Smye & Company, Eby, Blain & Company, the Wholesale Grocers' Guild, and Law, Young & Company being represented at the hearing, and what was alleged:—

It is ordered that the railway companies which, immediately before September 1, 1914, had in effect by tariffs filed with the board arrangements whereby mixed carloads of groceries, classifying fifth class in straight carloads, and dried fruits classifying 4th class in straight carloads, also foreign and domestic liquors in mixed carloads, were carried in each case at the carload rates applicable to each commodity respectively to destinations west of and including Port Arthur, Ont., publish and file tariffs restoring the said arrangements and making them effective from and including September 1, 1914, until otherwise ordered by the board, the said arrangements having been abolished by tariffs published and filed by the following railway and railroad companies, and numbered as follows, namely:—

Algoma Central, C.R.C. 251.

Boston and Maine, C.R.C. 1532, 1533, 1537, and 1542.

Canadian Northern, C.R.C. W. 794, W. 789, W. 812, W. 813, and E. 485.

Canadian Pacific, C.R.C. W. 1953, W. 1959, W. 1973, W. 1979, E. 2843, E. 2844, and E. 2845.

Central Vermont, C.R.C. 962, 964, 965, and 968.

Chatham, Wallaceburg and Lake Erie, C.R.C. 331, 332, 334, and Supplement 1 to 324.

Dominion Atlantic, C.R.C. 421, 422, and 424.

Essex Terminal, C.R.C. 236, 238, 239, and 241.

Grand Trunk, C.R.C. E. 2958, E. 2959, and E. 2977.

Grand Trunk Pacific, C.R.C. 23, 24, 36, and 41.

Great Northern, C.R.C. 1049, 1064, 1066, Supplement 13 to 925, and Supplement 3-A to 1019.

Hull Electric, C.R.C. 32 and 33.

Michigan Central, C.R.C. 2246, 2247, 2249, and Supplement 2 to 2200.

Midland of Manitoba, C.R.C. 44 and 47.

New York Central and Hudson River, C.R.C. 3179, 3180, 3183, and 3190.

Ottawa and New York, C.R.C. 1028, 1031, 1033, and 1036.

Pere Marquette, C.R.C. 1789, 1790, 1792, Supplement 8 to 1445, Supplement 6 to 1475, and Supplement 14 to 1041.

Quebec, Montreal and Southern, C.R.C. 503, 504, 506, and 510.

Quebec Railway, Light and Power, C.R.C. 73 and 74.

Schomberg and Aurora, C.R.C. 87, 88, and 92.

Thousand Islands, C.R.C. 250, 251, and 254.

Toronto, Hamilton and Buffalo, C.R.C. 972, 973, and 976.

Wabash, C.R.C. 806, 807, and 809.

Windsor, Essex and Lake Shore Rapid, C.R.C. 143, 144, 146, and 147.

(Sgd.) D'ARCY SCOTT,

Assistant Chief Commissioner,

Board of Railway Commissioners for Canada.

Ottawa, October 2, 1914.

GENERAL ORDER No. 133.

In the matter of the proposed cancellation on the 1st day of January, 1915, of the arrangements whereby mixed carloads of foreign and native liquors, and mixed carloads of groceries, classified 5th class in straight carloads, and dried fruits, classified 4th class in straight carloads, are carried at their respective carload rates between points west of and including Port Arthur, and thereto from eastern shipping points. (File No. 18755.21.)

Upon hearing the matter at the sittings of the board held in Toronto, December 12, 1914, the Toronto Board of Trade, the Montreal Board of Trade, the Hamilton Board of Trade, and other parties interested being represented at the hearing, and what was alleged; and upon reading the submissions filed:—

It is ordered that the proposed cancellation of the said arrangements be, and it is hereby, suspended until further order of the board.

(Sgd.) H. L. DRAYTON,

Chief Commissioner,

Board of Railway Commissioners for Canada.

Ottawa, December 19, 1914.

GENERAL ORDER No. 134.

In the matter of the amendment of the standard regulation of the board as to the opening of new lines, so as to provide that, in addition to filing the Standard Mileage Tariff applicable to traffic on the portion of the railway to be opened, the appropriate special tariffs also be filed. (File No. 25343.)

Upon hearing the matter at the sittings of the board held in Ottawa, January 5, 1915, the Canadian Pacific, the Grand Trunk, the Canadian Northern, and the Grand

Trunk Pacific Railway Companies being represented by counsel at the hearing, and what was alleged

It is ordered that railway companies subject to the jurisdiction of the board making application to open for traffic under section 261 of the Railway Act (as distinct from obtaining, under subsection 7, as amended, of the aforesaid section, leave to carry traffic where, because of the needs of settlers or other urgent condition, public convenience will be served thereby) be, and they are hereby, required, before opening for the carriage of traffic any extensions of their existing railway systems west of lake Superior, to publish and file the appropriate supplementary special class or "town" tariffs, mileage commodity tariffs, and special tariffs on grain to the lake Superior terminals, and on lumber from British Columbia, as these may be applicable to the territories to be served by the said new lines, in addition to the standard mileage tariffs therefor.

(Signed) H. L. DRAYTON,
Chief Commissioner,
Board of Railway Commissioners for Canada.

OTTAWA, January 25, 1915.

GENERAL ORDER No. 135.

In the matter of the complaint of the Middle West Federated Boards of Trade, on behalf of the *Sun* Publishing Company of Brandon, Manitoba, complaining that the rates charged by the Canadian Pacific Railway Company on newsprint paper from Ottawa and other eastern shipping points to Brandon, as compared with the rates charged to Winnipeg, unjustly discriminate in favour of Winnipeg and against Brandon. (File No. 24602.)

Upon hearing the application at the sittings of the board held in Brandon on the 25th day of June, 1914, the applicants and the Canadian Pacific Railway Company being represented at the hearing, and what was alleged; and upon reading the report of the Chief Traffic Officer of the board—

It is ordered as follows, namely:

1. That the through rates of freight on newsprint paper, in carloads of 40,000 pounds minimum weight, from the points of shipment thereof, by the all-rail route, to the Canadian points of consumption west of Fort William, be made by the addition to the fifth-class published tariff rates from Port Arthur and Fort William of the following special arbitraries for the purposes of this order, namely:

From Sault Ste. Marie, Ontario	15	cents per	100 pounds.
From Espanola, Ontario	15	"	"
From Sturgeon Falls, Ontario	15	"	"
From Merritton, Ontario	25	"	"
From Ottawa, Ontario	25	"	"
From Hull, Quebec	25	"	"
From Windsor Mills, Quebec	25	"	"
From Shawinigan Falls, Quebec	25	"	"
From Grand Mere, Quebec	25	"	"

2. That other points of shipment of newsprint paper east of Sault Ste. Marie (if any) be added to those named above at through rates appropriate to these herein prescribed.

3. That the said through rates be published and filed to take effect not later than the 15th day of April, 1915.

(Signed) H. L. DRAYTON,
Chief Commissioner,
Board of Railway Commissioners for Canada.

OTTAWA, March 22, 1915.

GENERAL ORDER No. 136.

In the matter of the application of the Canadian Freight Association on behalf of railway companies subject to the jurisdiction of the Board, under Section 340 of the Railway Act, for an Order approving a new form of "Release" in connection with the carriage of household goods, on file with the Board under file No. 23507.

Upon reading what is filed in support of the application, and the report of the Chief Traffic Officer of the Board—

It is Ordered as follows, namely:—

1. That the said form of "Release," being a form of special contract limiting the liability of the carrier in respect of the carriage of the undermentioned traffic, on file with the Board under the said file No. 23507, be, and it is hereby, approved as amended by the Board; the said form being in the terms following, namely:—

"SPECIAL CONTRACT.

.....Railway Company.

LIMITATION OF RESPONSIBILITY IN CONNECTION WITH THE CARRIAGE OF HOUSEHOLD GOODS, FURNITURE AND SETTLERS' EFFECTS (ALL SECOND-HAND).

Consignee and Destination.	Description of Articles.

In consideration of the.....Railway Company and its connecting carriers receiving the above mentioned property for carriage from .....station, consigned to..... at.....station, at a lower rate than the said Company and its connecting carriers might otherwise lawfully charge and be liable for injury to or loss of the said goods and property, or any of it, the said lower and the higher rates being as provided for in the Canadian Freight Classification, or current special tariffs, I do hereby undertake that no claim in respect of injury to, or loss of the said property, or any of it, will be made against the said company and its connections, or any of them, exceeding the amount of ten dollars ($10.00) for any one of the packages and its contents, or any one article not enclosed in a package, whether such injury or loss is occasioned by the negligence of the said company, its connections, or any of them, or its or their servants or agents, or any of them, or otherwise howsoever.

.....

Shipper."

2. That all railway companies under the jurisdiction of the Board be, and they are hereby, directed to discontinue the use of their present forms of "Release" limiting their liability with respect to the carriage of the property referred to in Section No. 1, of this Order, and to substitute therefor the form herein prescribed until otherwise ordered by the Board.

3. That the Canadian Freight Classification, also, if necessary, any special tariffs affected by these provisions, be amended so as to conform to this Order.

(Sgd.) H. L. DRAYTON,
Chief Commissioner,
Board of Railway Commissioners for Canada.

OTTAWA, March 25, 1915.

GENERAL ORDER No. 137.

In the matter of the application of the Express Traffic Association of Canada, on behalf of the express companies subject to the jurisdiction of the Board, for approval of a proposed amendment to the Express Classification for Canada, No. 3, providing a rating for storage batteries charged with acid, and conditions of carriage thereof, the acceptance by the express companies of such batteries being prohibited by the present classification: and on the application of Death & Watson, Limited, of Toronto. (File No. 4397-19.)

Upon reading what is filed in support of the application, and the report and recommendation of the Chief Traffic Officer of the Board—

It is ordered that the proposed amendment to the said Express Classification for Canada No. 3, as follows, namely:—

"Batteries, storage, to be charged at 'Merchandise' rates.

If empty, the batteries must be boxed or crated.

If charged with acid, the batteries must be placed in a strong wooden box and surrounded and covered by excelsior or other porous material that will not be attacked chemically by the liquid, and in quantity sufficient to absorb and hold all of the liquid contained therein.

Batteries must be packed with filling holes up.

The outside box should be so constructed, with projecting sides and ends with gable top, that it cannot be placed in any other than an upright position, and cannot be stood on side, end, or top.

On the outside container must be placed a white label, reading:—

NOTICE.

Handle carefully.

ACID.

Do not load with inflammables

protected by yellow labels.

Shipper's name."

be, and it is hereby, approved.

(Sgd.) H. L. DRAYTON,
Chief Commissioner,
Board of Railway Commissioners for Canada.

OTTAWA, March 26, 1915.

CIRCULAR No. 133.

OTTAWA, May 5, 1914.

File 4741-F, Part 2, Re *Fire Reports.*

I am directed to advise you that in view of the replies received to Circular No. 132, the Board has decided to request railway companies to submit monthly, in duplicate, reports on fires originating within three hundred feet of the track and burning over an area of 100 square feet or more outside the right of way. It is understood that the submission of such reports shall be limited to lines or portions of lines to be broadly classified as running through forest sections. The information to be furnished as to each such fire is as follows:

Date Subdivision Mileage
Time discovered by whom
Means taken to extinguish
How far from track did fire start
In what did fire start (as grass, old stump, old log, etc.)
Probable cause of fire
Area burned over: Grass or cultivated land.....acres.
Young forest growth .....acres.
Timber .....acres.
Slashing or old burn not reforesting.....acres.
Total area burned .....acres.

Character and amount of other property destroyed.....

The prompt submission of reports in accordance with the above is requested. Such reports should be submitted direct to the Chief Fire Inspector of the Board at Ottawa, or to such local officers of the Board as may be specified by the Chief Fire Inspector. The question as to the lines or portions of lines to be covered by these reports will be determined by the Chief Fire Inspector, who will communicate directly with the railway companies regarding this matter.

Yours truly

A. D. CARTWRIGHT,
Secretary B.R.C.

CIRCULAR No. 134.

OTTAWA, May 26, 1914.

File No. 7179. Working Time Tables.

I am directed to call attention of the railway companies subject to the board's jurisdiction to the necessity of filing with the commission working time tables, and to ask that your company arrange to send to the board's chief operating officer three copies of each working time table or supplement thereto at the time of its going into effect.

By order of the board,

A. D. CARTWRIGHT,
Secretary, B.R.C.

CIRCULAR No. 135.

OTTAWA, August 21, 1914.

File No. 9451. Increased Tolls for exclusive use of Drawing Rooms or Compartments in Sleeping and Parlour Cars.

General Order of the Board No. 130, dated the 28th day of July, 1914, disallowed increased tolls for the exclusive use of drawing rooms or compartments in sleeping and parlour cars, locally between points both of which are in Canada.

The railway companies are required to show cause in writing on or before the 7th day of September, 1914, why the same action should not be taken as to the Canadian portion on international movements.

By order of the board,

A. D. CARTWRIGHT,
Secretary, B.R.C.

CIRCULAR No. 136.

OTTAWA, October 17, 1914.

File No. 1750.10. Interpretation of Section 4 of Order No. 12225 (General Order No. 65), re Conductors for Light Engines.

The attention of the board having been called to different interpretations put upon section 4 of Order No. 12225 (General Order 65), it is ruled:—

That in the case of the movement of a light engine, or two or more light engines coupled, for a distance greater than twenty-five miles, when the movement is either on a single track or against the current of traffic on a double track, the word "conductor" as used in section 4 of Order 12225 (General Order No. 65), shall mean one regularly appointed for service as a conductor and possessed of the qualifications set out under subsection "*b*" of section 6 of the aforesaid order.

By order of the board,

A. D. CARTWRIGHT,
Secretary, B.R.C.

CIRCULAR No. 137.

OTTAWA, December 2, 1914.

File 25177, Operation of Crossing Plants at Crossings between Steam and Electric Railways.

At the sittings of the board to be held in the City Hall, Toronto, Ontario, on Friday, December 11, 1914, commencing at ten o'clock in the forenoon, railway companies subject to the jurisdiction of the board will be required to speak to the question as to why in the case of a steam railway crossing an electric railway, where there is a heavy movement by the electric railway and only an infrequent movement by the steam railway, the employees on the train of the steam railway should not operate the plant when desiring to make a crossing, leaving it normally clear for the electric railway.

By order of the board.

A. D. CART RIGHT,
Secretary, B.R.C.

CIRCULAR No. 138.

OTTAWA, December 19, 1914.

File 24942. Changes in Time-tables.

At the sittings of the board to be held in the Central Station Building, Ottawa, Ontario, on Tuesday, January 5, 1915, commencing at ten o'clock in the forenoon, railway companies subject to the jurisdiction of the board will be required to speak to the question of having public time-tables printed and distributed for the public notice ten days before the same take effect, and to furnish the board with copies of working time-tables, or notices of cancellation of trains seven days prior to effective date.

By order of the board.

A. D. CARTWRIGHT,
Secretary, B.R.C.

CIRCULAR No. 139.

OTTAWA, January 13, 1915.

File 24942. Changes in Train Time.

To all Railway Companies subject to the jurisdiction of the Board

At a conference of the representatives of the railway companies and the chief operating officer of the board in Ottawa, on Tuesday, January 5, 1915, the following regulations were discussed and decided upon:—

In addition to the announcements made and the advertising now done by the railway companies subject to the jurisdiction of the board, the said companies shall in the future post at all ticket offices, stations, and other public places, ten days prior to any change in its passenger train service, a notice reading:—

> "Change of time will be made. . . . . For particulars apply to ticket agent."
>
> (Signed by) Officer in charge.

Coincident with the posting of this notice, a circular addressed to agents and others concerned, giving a skeleton outline of the changes, shall be placed in the hands of all agents, and by them the information shall be given to the public.

Further, all the said companies shall send to the office of the chief operating officer of the board, in Ottawa, and also to the superintendent of Railway Mail Service for the district, seven days before the change takes effect, a copy of the notice withdrawing any train, or a working time-table complete, or the last proof thereof.

By order of the board.

Secretary, B.R.C.

CIRCULAR No. 140.

OTTAWA, January 22, 1915.

File 16513. Inspection of Locomotive Boilers.

To provide a proper service period between hydrostatic tests, removal of caps from flexible stay-bolts and removal of flues for locomotives which are stored for an extended period, the time for performing such work on locomotives which are stored in good condition for one or more full calendar months may be extended without filing application as follows:

Hydrostatic tests will be due after twelve months' service, provided such service is performed within 24 consecutive months.

Removal of caps from flexible staybolts will be due after 18 months' service, provided such service is performed within thirty consecutive months.

Removal of flues will be due after three years' service, provided such service is performed within four consecutive years.

Time out of service must be properly covered by out of service reports and notation showing the months out of service on account of which the extension is claimed made on the back of inspection reports and cab cards.

No extension of time as provided above will be allowed for portions of a month.

If the locomotive is out of service when any of the above work is due, it need not be performed until just prior to the time the locomotive is returned to service.

By order of the board.

A. D. CARTWRIGHT,
Secretary, B.R.C.

CIRCULAR No. 141.

OTTAWA, January 25, 1915.

File 4741-B, Spark Arresting Device for use on Locomotives burning Non-coking Coal.

During the past two years, numerous complaints have been received by the board as to fire danger resulting from the use as locomotive fuel of certain classes of western coals. A careful investigation of this situation by the board's officers reveals the fact that excessive sparking results from the use of such coals, and that, even when kept in perfect order, the spark-arresting devices prescribed in Regulation 2 of General Order No. 107 are inadequate to reduce within reasonable limits the number of live sparks thrown from the stack. The existence of this situation has already been recognized by some of the western railways, which have voluntarily discontinued the use of such coals as locomotive fuel during the fire season.

It appears from analyses made by the Mines Branch that the coals in question are not lignites, but that in each case where such trouble has occurred the coal has poor coking properties, or is non-coking, while the use of coals which exhibit good coking properties result in only a normal amount of sparking.

The board does not desire to hamper in any way the legitimate development of any phase of the important industry of coal mining. It is, however, considered essential that some steps be taken to reduce to normal proportions the fire hazard resulting from the use of such coals as are above described. To meet this situation, the board has under consideration the advisability of amending Regulation 2 of General Order No. 107 by adding thereto the following:—

> (*c*) There shall be such special spark-arresting device, other than the above, as may be approved by the board, on every engine burning coal which has poor coking properties or is non-coking, the use of which, as locomotive fuel, is not prohibited by Regulation 7 of this order.

All parties interested are requested to submit their comments to the board, in writing, not later than February 20, 1915. If an order dealing with this matter is issued, it is expected that such order will be made effective on and after April 1, 1915. In such event, arrangements will be made by the board, upon application by any railway company concerned, for the prompt testing jointly with the company of any spark-arresting device which it is claimed will meet the above conditions.

By order of the board,

A. D. CARTWRIGHT,
Secretary, B.R.C.

SUPPLEMENT No. 1 TO CIRCULAR No. 141.

OTTAWA, February 16, 1915.

File 4741-B, Spark Arresting Device for use on Locomotives burning Non-coking Coal.

Referring to Circular No. 141 of January 25, 1915. Owing to several requests made by parties interested that the date set for the submission of comments to the board be extended, I am directed to advise you that the board has decided to extend the date set in Circular No. 141 to March 16, 1915.

By order of the board,

A. D. CARTWRIGHT,
Secretary, B.R.C.

INDEX TO APPENDIX "C" BEING SOME OF THE PRINCIPAL JUDGMENTS ISSUED BY THE BOARD.

PAGE

Approaches to farm crossing on farm of Mr. Colwill.. 262
Ashbridge Bay spur, Toronto, G.T.R.. 144
Bilton, W. S., complaint *re* charges on car of coal from Ogdensburg, N.Y., to Newboro', Ont., via ferry at Prescott.. 308
Boland, W. J., application to compel Grand Trunk Railway Company to extend Fairbanks-Morse Canadian Company siding, Toronto, to certain property rented for factory purposes.. 266
Brampton Milling Company's switching complaint.. 227
Brownlee, D. A., et al., complaint *re* coal rates.. 250
Buckworth, A. B., inquiry whether board has jurisdiction over rates charged by construction department.. 241
Calgary, Alta., application for Canadian Pacific Railway spur.. 181
Calgary—*re* interchange tracks between Grand Trunk Pacific Railway and Canadian Pacific Railway.. 254
Calgary, Alta., application to compel Canadian Northern Railway to carry out agreement *re* street crossings.. 263
Campbellford, Lake Ontario and Western Railway application to take certain lands in Bowmanville, Ont., for freight yard.. 133
Campbellford, Lake Ontario and Western Railway business spur, Trenton, Ont... 175
Campbellford, Lake Ontario and Western Railway location and construction in Belleville, Ont.. 215
Campbellford, Lake Ontario and Western Railway Company's application to revise location of commercial siding at Trenton, Ont.. 333
Canadian Northern Western Railway application to cross Canadian Pacific Railway, Medicine Hat, Alta.. 166
Canadian Northern Railway application to remove connection between Canadian Pacific Railway and Winnipeg Joint Terminal tracks at Higgins avenue, Winnipeg, Man.. 246
an Northern Ontario Railway application for approval location through town of North Bay, Ont.. 288
Canadian Northern Quebec Railway application to construct sidings across Stadacona and Marlborough streets, Montreal, Que.. 290
Canadian Northern Ontario Railway application to cross Monkland Boulevard, Cartierville, Que.. 314
Canadian Northern Railway train service from Trenton to Kinmount Junction, complaints as to.. 329
Canadian China Clay Company v. Canadian Northern Railway Company, et al, *re* rates on clay... 326
Canadian Pacific Railway application to lower grade of portion of Maple street, Winnipeg, Man.. 226
Canadian Pacific Railway application to alter spur of city of Winnipeg on Rachel street. 227
Canadian Pacific Railway application to carry two additional tracks across Greene avenue, Westmount, Que... 307
Central Convention of Farmers Institutes of British Columbia application for privilege of shipping mixed cars of flour and feed in sacks, etc., at carload rates.. 261
Coldwater, Ont., *re* interchange tracks between Canadian Pacific Railway and Grand Trunk Railway.. 223
Consumers' Gas Company of Toronto v. Canadian Pacific Railway, *re* coke rates.. 156
Coquitlam, B.C., location of Canadian Pacific Railway station.. 147
Courtney, B.C., application to direct Esquimalt and Nanaimo Railway to permit Government to make road from freight shed to Lake Trail.. 230
Cowichan Ratepayers' Association, complaint *re* culvert on line of Esquimalt and Nanaimo Railway (C.P.R.).. 163
Cowichan Ratepayers' Association, complaint against rates charged on grain and mill feeds.. 300
Cumberland, B.C., Board of Trade application for interchange tracks between Canadian Collieries Limited, and Esquimalt and Nanaimo Railway at Royston... 265
Denholm Drainage under Guelph and Goderich Railway.. 196
Eastern Townships Brick Manufacturing Company's complaint *re* interswitching.. 163
Edmonton City Dairy, application to direct Dominion Express Company to pay refund under Rule 3, C.R.C. 4139.. 158
Edmonton, Dunvegan and British Columbia Railway *re* rates on.. 340
Entwistle, Alta., *re* location Grand Trunk Pacific station.. 183
Erie and Ontario Railway crossing over right of way of Niagara, St. Catharines and Toronto Railway... 200
Esquimalt Municipality application for station facilities on Esquimalt and Nanaimo Railway at Admirals Road... 271
Esquimalt and Nanaimo Railway Company application to remove station agent from Cowichan, B.C.. 326

PAGE

Essex Terminal Railway Company application objecting to removal as participating carrier in tariffs applicable to international traffic.. 138
Essex Terminal Railway Company application to construct branch line to and along Russell street, Sandwich, Ont.. 334
Farm crossings on Canadian Pacific Railway near Foster Station, Que., application to reopen.. 177
Fernie-Fort Steele Brewing Company, complaint *re* heated car service supplied by Canadian Pacific Railway Company.. 309
Fergus, Ont., complaint against Grand Trunk Railway Company switching rate.. 172
Fonthill Gravel Company v. Niagara, St. Catharines and Toronto Railway Company, and Grand Trunk Railway Company *re* rates on moulding sand.. 120
Fortin, Mr. Justice; complaint *re* cancellation by Canadian Pacific Railway of 8 o'clock train from St. Jerome to Montreal, Que.. 287
Fort William complaint *re* Canadian Pacific Railway Company taking up street railway tracks where crossed by spur to Starch Werks.. 124
Fort William, Ont., complaint *re* condition of Grand Trunk Pacific Railway on Empire avenue.. 170
Fort William, Ont., proposed location of Canadian Northern Railway station.. 189
Fort William, Ont., application for Canadian Pacific Railway spur to industries.. 210
Fort William Board of Trade application to direct Canadian Pacific Railway Company to provide local freight sheds at Fort William separate from wharf sheds.. 249
Fort William Board of Trade application for reduction in rates for shipments westward originating at Fort William.. 277
Fort William Board of Trade complaint against switching charges.. 278
Fort William Board of Trade application *re* cartage service at Fort William.. 286
Fredericton, N.B., application to remedy rates to and from; also Canadian Pacific Railway Company's application for a rehearing in connection with judgment of July 18, 1914.. 255
Gillies Bros., et al, application for interchange track between Canadian Pacific Railway and Grand Trunk Railway at Arnprior, Ont.. 228
Grand Trunk Railway—Ashbridge Bay spur, Toronto.. 144
Grand Trunk Railway v. Hamilton Radial Electric Railway *re* interchange at Burlington, Ont.. 160
Grand Trunk Railway Company; application to replace Hamilton and Toronto Sewer Pipe and Fowler Canadian Company siding.. 190
Grand Trunk Railway dock siding encroachment on Main street, Callander, Ont.. 248
Grand Trunk Railway Company's crossing between Aspdin and Huntsville on town line between Stisted and Stephenson; application Miss G. Lakeman as to dangerous condition of.. 324
Grand Valley Railway Company, anomalous position of.. 321
Grouard, Right Rev., et al., application for settlers' rates on shipments from Eastern Canada.. 303
Guest, W. J., Fish Company, complaint *re* express rates on fresh fish from Vancouver to Winnipeg.. 197
Hamilton Radial Electric Railway Company *re* Grand Trunk Railway interchange at Burlington, Ont.. 160
Hamilton, S. A., Co., Ltd., application for Canadian Pacific Railway spur Prairie Heights, Sask.. 124
Hamilton, S. A., Co., Ltd., application for transfer track between Canadian Northern Railway and Canadian Pacific Railway at Howick or for joint freight tariff on coal by Canadian Northern Railway and Canadian Pacific Railway.. 243
Hamilton and Toronto, Hamilton and Buffalo Railway, spur across Victoria avenue south. 154
Hamilton Street Railway Company application to cross Grand Trunk Railway on Kenilworth avenue.. 231
Hepworth Silica Pressed Brick Company, application to direct Grand Trunk Railway to construct spur to; also complaint against switching rate.. 206
Hull Electric Railway Company application for approval standard passenger rate of 2½ cents a mile.. 339
Humberstone Township application to direct Grand Trunk Railway to construct suitable culverts under railway.. 137
Imperial Oil Company, Ltd., application for reduction in carload freight rates on petroleum and products from Vancouver east to Alberta points.. 123
Independent Telephone Company v. Bell Telephone Company.. 179
Independent Van and Storage Company complaint *re* rates on household effects.. 251
Keele street, Toronto, *re* maintenance of subway under Canadian Pacific Railway.. 225
Lachine, Que., protection at 18th street.. 135
Lachine, Jacques-Cartier and Maisonneuve Railway; application for approval of location from point on St. Catharines street, Montreal, to connection with Grand Trunk Railway near Jacques Cartier Junction.. 281
Lachine, Jacques-Cartier and Maisonneuve Railway crossing certain streets in Montreal, Que.. 293
Lehnhart, J. W., Mazenod, Sask., complaint *re* movement of carload of machinery.. 184
Listowel, Ont., application for interchange track between Canadian Pacific Railway and Grand Trunk Railway.. 205
London Railway Commission on behalf of London and Port Stanley Railway, application for approval of clearances.. 279
Manitoba Sand and Gravel Company application *re* Grand Trunk Pacific Railway rates on

PAGE

sand and gravel.. 169
Massey Harris Company, et al., v. Canadian Northern and Grand Trunk Pacific Railway Companies *re* spur tracks.. 176
Mayland, A. H., Calgary, complaint *re* charge of Canadian Pacific Railway on shipment of cattle.. 251
McPherson, J. H., application for Canadian Pacific Railway siding to stone quarry, Gore of Puslinch, Ont.. 153
Milton Pressed Brick Company, complaint against Canadian Pacific Railway holding up double track construction between Toronto and Guelph Junction.. 135
Mixed carloads of foreign and native liquors, groceries and dried fruits.. 246
Montreal Board of Trade application to reinstate mixed carload commodity rates.. 193
Montreal Light, Heat and Power Company, application to lay gas pipe across Grand Trunk Railway property near western end of Turcot Yards.. 151
Montreal, Que., application to open up certain streets in Longue Point Ward over Canadian Northern Quebec Railway.. 200
Moosejaw Board of Trade's complaint *re* coal rates.. 241
Napanee and Deseronto train service.. 304
North Himsworth complaint *re* the encroachment the dock siding of the Grand Trunk Railway has made on Main street, Callender, Ont.. 248
Oliver Township complaint *re* inadequate train service of Canadian Pacific Railway.. 189
Ontario Department of Public Works, application *re* crossing Canadian Pacific Railway, lot 10, con. 3, township of Burwash.. 338
Ozias, C. W., et al., complaint *re* closing of Mazeppa Station, Alta.. 230
Park Avenue crossing over Canadian Pacific Railway, Montreal.. 213
Parry Sound, Ont., application *re* subway at Armstrong street under Canadian Pacific Railway.. 193
Patrick, T. H., Souris, Man., complaint against Canadian Pacific Railway refusing to place cars on siding into his lumber yard.. 316
Picton Board of Trade, et al., complaint *re* train and mail service on the Canadian Northern Ontario Railway.. 304
Port Hope Telephone Company, application for connection with Bell Telephone Company in town of Bowmanville, Ont.. 122
Quebec Oriental Railway Company, complaint as to service of.. 128
Railway company applies to have Board take action against a conductor.. 172
Riverside Lumber Company, Calgary, complaint *re* Canadian Pacific rates.. 202
Roberts, E. W., complaint *re* refusal of Canadian Pacific Railway to establish winter freight rate on "rough, unpeeled pulpwood".. 343
Rogers, G. T., complaint against overcharge by Canadian Pacific Railway on car of settlers effects.. 162
Rosetown, Sask., application for transfer track between Canadian Pacific Railway and Canadian Northern Railway.. 275
Seventeenth avenue, Moosejaw, Sask., protection where Canadian Pacific Railway crosses. 274
Shephard Local Improvement, application for highway crossing over Canadian Pacific Railway.. 253
Shragge, B., application for Canadian Pacific Railway spur to warehouse, Winnipeg, Man. 161
Smart-Woods, Ltd., complaint that delivering carriers disclaim responsibility for shortage when received "short" from their connections.. 185
St. Mary's Horse Shoe Quarry v. Grand Trunk Railway, *re* operation of siding.. 157
St. Louis, Saskatchewan, siding, Grand Trunk Pacific.. 186
" " " " .. 319
Standard railway fences.. 174
Standard regulations *re* opening of new lines.. 272
Station agents, *re* discontinuing employment of.. 294
Stettler Board of Trade, Alberta, application to direct Canadian Pacific Railway and Canadian Northern Railway to provide transfer track.. 164
Storage of merchandise by railway companies at Fort William and Port Arthur.. 318
Streetsville, Ont., subway under Canadian Pacific Railway.. 127
Syndicate avenue subway, Fort William, *re* paving of.. 311
Taylor Milling and Elevator Company, of Lethbridge, Alta., complaint *re* rates.. 262
Toronto Board of Trade, et al., complaint *re* Grand Trunk Railway's refusal to accept from Canadian Northern Railway carload freight requiring team track delivery at Toronto.. 125
Trenton, Ont., application for interchange between Canadian Northern Railway and Canadian Pacific Railway at Trenton.. 328
Vancouver and North Vancouver, B.C., complaint against Canadian Pacific Railway Company changing plans of North Vancouver Ferry Pedestrian subway.. 211
Victoriaville, Que., *re* extension of Albert street over Grand Trunk Railway.. 201
Welland County, application to rescind order authorizing Toronto, Hamilton and Buffalo Railway to divert four highways.. 171
Winnipeg, Man., Talbot avenue subway where Canadian Pacific Railway crosses.. 167
Winnipeg, Man., *re* subway at Salter street where Canadian Pacific Railway crosses.. 168
Winnipeg, Man., application for subway at Maple street.. 244
Wolfville Milling Company, application to determine responsibility for maintenance of spur to their property.. 276
Wood, W. J., complaint against mixed train service of Canadian Pacific Railway between Winnipeg and Riverton.. 317
Yukon Gold Company, application to require its tracks.. 243
Yukon Gold Company, application to require Klondike Mines Railway Company to elevate its tracks.. 243

TELEPHONE STATISTICS

OF THE

DOMINION OF CANADA

FOR THE

YEAR ENDED JUNE 30

1915

PRINTED BY ORDER OF PARLIAMENT

OTTAWA
PRINTED BY J. DE L. TACHÉ, PRINTER TO THE KING'S MOST EXCELLENT MAJESTY
[No. 20*d*—1916] 1916

To Field Marshal, His Royal Highness Prince Arthur William Patrick Albert, Duke of Connaught and of Strathearn, K.G., K.T., K.P., etc., etc., etc., Governor General and Commander in Chief of the Dominion of Canada.

MAY IT PLEASE YOUR ROYAL HIGHNESS:

The undersigned has the honour to present to your Royal Highness the Annual Report of the Comptroller of Statistics in relation to the telephone interests of the Dominion of Canada for the year ended June 30, 1915.

F. COCHRANE,
Minister of Railways and Canals.

To the Honourable F. COCHRANE,
Minister of Railways and Canals.

SIR,—I have the honour to submit the report of the Comptroller of Statistics in relation to the telephone interests of the Dominion of Canada for the year ended June 30, 1915.

I have the honour to be, sir,
Your obedient servant,

A. W. CAMPBELL,
Deputy Minister of Railways and Canals.

OFFICE OF THE COMPTROLLER OF STATISTICS,

OTTAWA, January 28, 1916.

A. W. CAMPBELL, Esq., C.E.,

Deputy Minister of Railways and Canals.

SIR,—I have the honour to submit herewith Telephone Statistics for the year ended June 30, 1915.

Reports were received from 1,396 units, as compared with 1,136 for the year 1914.

In every respect the returns disclose marked growth in the telephone interests of the Dominion.

It was not deemed expedient to alter the reporting forms which have been in use for a number of years. These forms are exceedingly simple in character; yet an elaboration would not be suitable for the very large number of small companies, many of them on a co-operative basis, which have not adopted more than elementary methods of accounting.

It will probably be found practicable at an early date to prescribe two classes of reporting forms, one applicable to large corporations, and the other to smaller units.

ORGANIZATION.

The number and character of the various organizations which made returns for the year ended June 30 last are shown in the following statement:—

Province.	Government.	Municipal.	Stock.	Co-operative.	Partnership.	Private.	Total.
Nova Scotia			29	83	3	8	123
New Brunswick			16	6		4	26
Prince Edward Island			4	22		1	27
Quebec			54	58	2	31	145
Ontario	1	50	148	209	21	63	492
Manitoba	1	5	6	15	2	9	38
Saskatchewan	1	5	310	204			520
Alberta	1	1	5	3			10
British Columbia		1	11	1		1	14
Yukon			1				1
Total	4	62	584	601	28	117	1,396

Following is a comparison of the different classes of organizations in 1913, 1914 and 1915.

	1913.	1914.	1915.
Government	4	4	4
Municipal	52	58	62
Stock	543	611	584
Co-operative	262	297	601
Partnership	63	48	28
Private	151	118	117
Total	1,075	1,136	1,396

By provinces, following is a statement of the number of reporting organizations in 1915 and the four preceding years:—

Province.	1911.	1912.	1913.	1914.	1915.
Nova Scotia	14	12	83	83	123
New Brunswick	16	17	25	24	26
Prince Edward Island	1	1	1	1	27
Quebec	32	62	101	127	145
Ontario	319	369	451	468	492
Manitoba	3	3	35	38	38
Saskatchewan	143	206	361	369	520
Alberta	4	3	3	9	10
British Columbia	5	10	15	16	14
Yukon	0	0	0	1	1
Total	537	683	1,075	1,136	1,396

The foregoing statement will be better understood if the situation is explained with respect to several of the provinces. In Manitoba and Alberta practically all telephone interests are in the hands of the Local Governments. In Saskatchewan the Provincial Government operates in all the large centres, but has not taken over the 520 small units which spread their wires over the rural sections of the province. In all the provinces there is a growing tendency toward consolidation, which has the effect of reducing the number of reports without lessening the availability of tepehone service.

CAPITALIZATION AND COST.

Capitalization in 1915 reached a total of $74,284,991.51, involving an increment for the year of $3,993,107.36

Following are the facts in this regard, with the division of liability, for 1915 and the preceding years:—

	1911.	1912.	1913.	1914.	1915.
	$ cts.	$ cts.	$ cts.	$ cts.	$ cts.
Stocks	21,527,374 55	21,533,605 09	26,590,501 39	28,644,340 00	28,947,122 02
Funded debt	18,516,607 74	24,743,246 65	33,256,503 44	41,647,544 15	45,337,869 49
Total	40,043,982 29	46,276,851 74	59,847,004 83	70,291,884 15	74,284,991 51

The distribution of capital liability, by provinces, in 1913, 1914 and 1915 was as follows:—

Province.	Stocks. 1915.	Funded Debt. 1915.	Total 1915.	Total 1914.	Total 1913.
	$ cts.	$ cts.	$ cts.	$ cts.	$ cts.
Nova Scotia	1,924,504 37	1,502,714 00	3,427,218 37	3,086,261 70	2,949,690 86
New Brunswick	1,339,128 81	119,749 00	1,458,877 81	1,421,244 87	1,424,750 15
Prince Edward Island	109,396 31	51,100 00	160,496 31	200,000 00	125,000 00
Quebec	19,375,960 69	11,704,041 35	31,080,002 04	30,950,074 39	24,739,525 56
Ontario	1,864,375 61	1,834,317 71	3,698,693 32	3,309,203 80	3,085,153 25
Manitoba	27,596 54	10,723,397 69	10,750,994 50	10,555,797 82	10,273,841 62
Saskatchewan	880,975 00	6,063,695 62	6,944,670 62	6,113,992 41	5,221,899 34
Alberta	109,013 60	10,818,670 52	10,927,684 12	8,875,205 33	6,929,249 89
British Columbia	3,251,171 09	2,520,183 33	5,771,354 42	5,715,103 83	5,097,884 16
Yukon	65,000 00	.....	65,000 00	65,000 00	.....
Total	28,947,122 02	45,337,869 49	74,284,991 51	70,291,884 15	59,847,004 83

It should be borne in mind, in considering the foregoing statement, that the whole of the capitalization of the Bell Telephone Company has been quite unavoidably assigned to the province of Quebec. The Company operates on a considerably larger scale in Ontario; but its headquarters happen to be in Montreal.

The cost of telephone property advanced from $80,258,356 in 1914 to $83.792,583.06 in 1915.

The total cost in 1913, 1914 and 1915 was distributed among the various provinces as follows:—

	1913.	1914.	1915.
	$ cts.	$ cts.	$ cts.
Nova Scotia	3,323,901 72	3,505,155 94	3,362,778 72
New Brunswick	1,653,722 11	1,742,697 05	1,823,367 43
Prince Edward Island	150,000 00	179,095 06	220,332 35
Quebec	33,002,264 17	37,234,492 02	38,590,730 66
Ontario	4,250,730 45	4,747,077 76	5,197,066 52
Manitoba	9,607,506 91	10,560,084 26	10,758,230 08
Saskatchewan	5,143,663 03	6,100,463 41	6,886,793 62
Alberta	6,472,098 13	9,671,700 52	10,351,912 38
British Columbia	5,611,084 93	6,347,410 20	6,431,191 52
Yukon	.....	170,179 78	170,179 78
Total	69,214,971 45	80,258,356 00	83,792,583 06

Here again regard must be had for the facts with respect to the Bell Telephone Company to which allusion has already been made.

Total cost was equal to $157.21 per telephone in service, as compared with $154.03 in 1914.

EARNINGS AND OPERATING EXPENSES.

The aggregate of gross earnings in 1915 was $17,601,672.82, or $304,403.85 in excess of the total for 1914.

Operating expenses amounted to $12, 836,715.12, as against $12,882,402.32 for the preceding year.

Net earnings, as represented by the difference between total receipts and operating cost, were $4,764,957.70. This was better by $350,091.04 than the result for 1914.

Gross earnings and operating expenses were distributed among the provinces in 1914 and 1915 as follows:—

Province.	1914.		1915.	
	Earnings.	Operating Expenses.	Earnings.	Operating Expenses.
	$ cts.	$ cts.	$ cts.	$ cts.
Nova Scotia	640,923 18	444,384 76	674,464 69	419,951 16
New Brunswick	446,533 88	258,713 64	478,887 08	265,157 75
Prince Edward Island	47,704 47	41,244 38	49,100 46	42,803 19
Quebec	9,600,449 52	7,352,259 10	9,824,437 02	7,495,188 28
Ontario	931,680 08	614,361 94	978,206 05	637,287 96
Manitoba	1,826,276 95	1,358,316 82	1,850,997 49	1,422,062 20
Saskatchewan	990,887 90	715,599 67	916,960 82	616,127 52
Alberta	1,101,507 83	801,324 82	1,136,312 76	641,694 92
British Columbia	1,674,086 43	1,281,589 95	1,653,394 22	1,282,744 57
Yukon	37,218 74	14,607 24	38,912 27	13,768 12
Total	17,297,268 98	12,882,402 32	17,601,672 86	12,836,715 12

INCOME ACCOUNT.

Companies having a capitalization of $25,000 and over are required to submit an Income Account. The following statement is the result of such reports:—

Gross revenue	$12,749,562 98	
Operating expenses	9,121,267 03	
Net operating revenue		$3,628,295 95
Additions:		
Outside operations	$ 21,113 66	
Rents	31,404 28	
From securities held	29,679 83	
Other income	212,298 51	
		294,496 28
Gross corporate income		$3,922,792 23
Deductions:		
Taxes	$ 275,055 61	
Interest on bonds	930,747 54	
Other deductions	100,325 82	
		1,306,128 97
Net corporate income		$2,627,775 88
Disposal of net income:		
Dividends—common	$ 1,759,158 02	
" —preferred	121,797 86	
Sinking funds	312,392 95	
Reserves	184,301 33	
		2,377,649 66
Balance		$ 300,733 19

Net corporate income in the above statement is the result of a further deduction of $11,112.62 in the nature of deficits, which is not shown in the summary. It appears, however, in Table 16 in the body of this report.

EQUIPMENT.

There were 533,090 telephones reported as being in use in 1915, as compared with 521,144 in 1914. The increase was 11,946.

On the basis of population, as estimated by the Census office, there was an average of one telephone in use to every 15.1 persons.

Of the 533,090 telephones in service, 313,225 were classified as being operated by central energy; and 219,865 by magneto. The latter are to be found in villages and rural districts.

There were 1,452,359.82 miles of wire in use in 1915, as against 1,343,090.07 in 1914. The 1915 wire mileage was divided as follows:—Urban, 1,009,146.79; rural, 443,213.03. The principal growth, as will be seen later, was in rural mileage.

There was one mile of telephone wire in service for every 5.6 persons constituting the total population. The ratio was 6.8 in 1914.

Telephones in use in 1915 and the three preceding years were distributed among the provinces as follows:—

Province.	Central energy.	Magneto.	Total 1915.	Total. 1914.	Total. 1913.	Total. 1912.
Nova Scotia	13,238	7,987	21,225	20,239	18,276	14,520
New Brunswick	9,714	7,803	17,517	16,473	14,508	12,893
Prince Edward Island	968	1,276	2,244	1,574	1,540	1,208
Quebec	62,948	29,544	92,492	91,047	81,913	66,573
Ontario	128,280	111,327	239,607	232,456	208,022	172,506
Manitoba	29,481	17,798	47,279	49,146	44,958	39,535
Saskatchewan	9,906	19,986	29,892	26,023	23,756	16,670
Alberta	20,770	15,979	36,749	37,118	30,194	15,801
British Columbia	37,920	7,810	45,730	46,713	40,504	31,178
Yukon	.....	355	355	355	.....	.....
Total	313,225	219,865	533,090	521,144	463,671	370,884

The wire mileage for 1914 and 1915 was divided into classes as follows:—

Classes of Wire.	1914.			1915.		
	Urban.	Rural.	Total.	Urban.	Rural.	Total.
	Miles.	Miles.	Miles.	Miles.	Miles.	Miles.
Galvanized	43,550 61	322,225 17	365,775 78	28,230 52	373,392 97	401,623 49
Copper	14,330 41	48,629 23	62,959 64	21,001 01	60,236 33	81,237 34
Cable—overhead	340,388 08	8,148 29	348,536 37	358,714 93	8,520 83	367,235 76
underground	563,431 84	251 00	563,682 84	600,212 53	149 50	600,362 03
submarine	1,246 55	888 89	2,135 44	987 80	913 40	1,901 20
Total	962,947 49	380,142 58	1,343,090 07	1,009,146 79	443,213 03	1,452,359 82

Total wire mileage, in 1914 and 1915, was distributed among the provinces as follows:—

Province.	1914.			1915.		
	Urban.	Rural.	Total.	Urban.	Rural.	Total.
	Miles.	Miles.	Miles.	Miles.	Miles.	Miles.
Nova Scotia	25,113 00	10,765 60	35,878 60	25,214 00	15,397 25	40,611 25
New Brunswick	16,843 67	8,999 19	25,842 86	18,448 17	9,403 80	27,851 97
Prince Edward Island	2,433 00	1,150 00	3,583 00	1,623 00	1,984 00	3,607 00
Quebec	201,680 00	56,200 85	257,880 85	182,726 00	69,517 55	252,243 55
Ontario	363,156 39	164,810 69	527,967 08	395,635 27	177,866 93	573,502 20
Manitoba	105,902 00	60,102 00	166,004 00	108,340 50	62,313 00	170,653 50
Saskatchewan	49,000 00	36,769 25	85,769 25	51,330 00	52,648 00	103,978 00
Alberta	82,140 00	30,204 25	112,344 25	103,818 00	42,592 00	146,410 00
British Columbia	116,447 43	10,773 75	127,221 18	121,779 75	11,123 50	132,903 25
Yukon	232 00	367 00	599 00	232 10	367 00	599 10
Total	962,947 49	380,142 58	1,343,090 07	1,009,146 79	443,213 03	1,452,359 82

EMPLOYEES.

There were 15,072 persons in the employ of telephone companies on June 30, 1915. For 1914 the number was 16,799.

The total of salaries and wages, however, was higher, an advance having been made from $8,250,253.19 in 1914 to $8,357,029.29 in 1915.

Following is a comparative summary, by provinces, of the number and remuneration of employees:—

Province.	1914.		1915.	
	Number.	Remuneration.	Number.	Remuneration.
		$ cts.		$ cts.
Nova Scotia	727	284,524 42	769	294,001 17
New Brunswick	441	158,521 86	451	161,460 57
Prince Edward Island	80	18,867 27	96	20,974 07
Quebec	4,188	2,060,173 17	3,723	1,924,682 23
Ontario	7,440	3,454,204 84	6,620	3,272,428 66
Manitoba	1,452	890,879 05	1,174	832,315 82
Saskatchewan	559	292,275 08	556	442,997 60
Alberta	759	160,703 82	680	616,062 37
British Columbia	1,146	916,570 54	996	781,058 32
Yukon	7	13,533 14	7	11,048 46
Total	16,799	8,250,253 19	15,072	8,357,029 27

SUMMARY.

The following table will afford a concise view of facts relating to the telephone interests of Canada since statistical information was available:—

	1911.	1912.	1913.	1914.	1915.
Capitalization	$40,043,982 29	$46,276,851 74	$59,847,004 83	$70,291,884 15	$74,284,991 51
Cost	34,737,529 95	56,887,799 15	69,214,971 45	80,258,356 00	83,792,583 06
Revenue	10,068,220 03	12,273,626 66	14,879,278 23	17,297,268 98	17,601,672 86
Operating Expenses	6,979,045 06	9,094,688 82	11,175,689 47	12,882,402 32	12,836,715 12
Remuneration	915,636 14	2,659,641 63	6,839,308 85	8,250,253 19	8,357,029 27
Telephone Companies	537	683	1,075	1,136	1,396
Wire Mileage	687,728	889,572	1,092,586	1,343,090	1,452,360
Telephones	302,759	370,884	463,671	521,144	533,090
Employees	10,425	12,783	12,867	16,799	15,072
Persons per telephone	23·8	19·3	16·2	15·5	15·1
Persons per mile of wire	10·4	8·1	6·8	6·0	5·6

Information in detail, by reporting units and province, will be found in the tables making up the body of this report.

I have the honour to be, sir,

Your obedient servant,

J. L. PAYNE,

Comptroller of Statistics.

TABLE 1.—Statement of Capital, Cost, Revenue, Operating Expenses, Number of Telephones, Employees, etc.

Name of Company.	Address.	Capital Stock.	Funded Debt.	Cost Property and Equipment.	Revenue.	Operating Expenses.	Number of Telephones.		Employees and Remuneration.	
							Central.	Magneto.	No.	Amount.
Ontario.		$ cts.	$ cts.	$ cts.	$ cts.	$ cts.				$ cts.
"A" Line Tel. Co	Harmony	635 44		750 44	115 00	115 00		23		
Aberdeen-Plummer Centre Tel. Co	Plummer	2,153 56	500 00	2,653 56	50 23	50 23		36	1	5 00
Admaston Tel. Asso	Admaston Station	722 00		1,390 00	173 20	65 00		27	1	62 00
Addison Tel. Co	Addison			11,000 00	2,578 90	2,231 46		172		
Aldboro Farmers' Tel. Asso	Rodney	2,220 00		5,000 00	1,800 00	800 00		169		
Alba Tel. Asso	Pembroke			6,500 00	710 50	704 25		84		
Allenford Tel. Co	Allenford			4,725 00	450 00	450 00		131	1	228 00
Algoma Central & Hudson Bay Ry. Co	Sault Ste. Marie			125,873 02	1,040 75	742 05		55	2	622 25
Algoma Eastern Ry. Co	Sault Ste. Marie			29,575 52	946 04	909 73		24	1	732 90
Alice Tel. Co	Pembroke	850 00		850 00	96 00	96 00		16		
Ahmic Tel. Co., Ltd	Ahmic Harbour	22,515 00	2,400 00	15,200 00	1,002 58	1,000 00		67	3	100 00
Alnwick Tel. Co., Ltd	Roseneath	5,000 00		4,000 00	607 66	209 05		103	4	175 00
Amable Tel. System	Hepworth			643 76	76 00	66 00		19	1	5 00
Amaranth Tel. Asso	Grand Valley	2,000 00		2,000 00	200 00	160 00		50	2	75 00
Ansonia & Thessalon Mun. Tel. Co	Thessalon		1,674 00	2,965 00	135 00	130 00		45	1	50 00
Apsley Tel. Co., Ltd	Apsley	2,230 00		2,902 46	414 75	381 75		42	2	148 05
Ardtrea Tel. Asso	Orillia			1,913 25	443 01	383 91		35	1	55 55
Armstrong Tel. Co	Earlton			513 30	121 30	121 23		18		
Arran No. I Tel. Co	Tara			2,700 00	297 20	277 50		68		
Ashgrove Tel. System	Georgetown	430 00		430 00	87 00	93 50		11		
Ayr Tel. Co., Ltd	Ayr	6,460 00		7,757 00	2,529 84	2,094 07		146	2	265 00
*Bell Telephone Co., Ltd	Montreal						121,296	44,346	5,426	†2,950,000 00
"B" Tel. Co	Richards Landing			100 00	15 00	15 00		3		
Back Line Tel Co	Melancthon	885 00		906 00	168 00	168 00		21		
Balaclava Tel. Club	Balaclava	2,492 00		2,492 00	288 50	288 50		36	1	20 00
Balderson Tel. Asso	Balderson			4,200 00	230 00	230 00		117	2	230 00
Balsam Hill Tel. Asso	Renfrew			1,200 00	101 12	96 55		24		
Balsam Grove Tel. Co	Cameron			904 00				16		
Barrie-Angus Tel. Line	Barrie	2,500 00		2,500 00				28		
Barrie Island Mutual Tel. Co	Barrie Island			800 00	55 00	55 00		22	1	42 00
Barton and Binbrook Tel. Co	Hamilton	9,290 00		12,531 74	3,839 46	2,434 71		138	2	1,040 00
Beaver Tel. Co	Woodville	360 00		350 00	2 50	2 50		13		
Beaver Valley Municipal System	Thornbury		23,200 00	21,000 00	4,110 48	1,721 62		246	2	
Beaver Mills Tel. Line	Cannington			90 00	24 00	24 00		4		

Beatty Tel. System	Garden Hill			7,000 00	1,500 00	1,000 00		134	7	1,000 00
Beeton Tel. Co., Ltd	Beeton	40,171 00		43,600 00	7,619 00	4,833 00		575	2	1,500 00
Belmont Co-op. Tel. Asso	Belmont	2,580 00		3,500 00	2,843 20	2,143 20		225	4	1,200 00
Berwick Private Line	Grand Valley			975 00	171 00	63 00		21		
Bethel Rural Tel. Asso	Dundalk	550 00		550 00	140 00	70 00		14		
Bethesda Mutual Tel. Co	Bowmanville	450 00		450 00	79 00	79 00		11		
Bethesda & Stouffville Tel. Co., Ltd	Stouffville	28,475 00	16,200 00	58,198 77	9,828 05	8,099 12		822	10	4,453 40
Bethany Tel. Union	Bethany			7,500 00	375 00	375 00		125	1	375 00
Billings Mutual Tel. Co	Kagawong	1,035 47		1,035 47	5 10	5 00		34		5 00
Blanchard Private Line	Cannington			500 00	95 00	30 00		9		
Blenheim & South Kent Tel. Co., Ltd	Blenheim	15,050 00	10,000 00	37,037 16	8,122 75	4,161 66		664	8	2,108 03
Blind Line Tel. Co	Bayview	493 50		493 50	231 30	228 80		12	1	7 50
Blyth Municipal Tel. System	Blyth		35,996 00	38,897 00	5,531 09	1,878 76		475	5	1,545 00
Bobcaygeon Tel. Co	Bobcaygeon	4,200 00		2,268 62	26 04	26 04		72	1	25 00
Bolton Tel. Co., Ltd	Bolton	14,750 00	10,400 00	46,074 04	9,273 86	6,725 50		700	3	2,055 37
Bond Corners Tel. System	Woodstock			300 00	102 23	102 23		11		5 00
Bond Tel. Co	Chesley			880 00	90 00	90 00		16		
Bowesville Mutual Tel. Asso	Bowesville	1,100 00		1,000 00	37 00	37 00		22		
Bowman Tel. System	Elmwood			1,800 00	1,000 00	450 00		109		
Bracebridge & Muskoka Lakes Tel. Co	Bracebridge	9,700 00		17,512 37	3,555 16	2,265 80		90	5	1,311 66
Bradden Tel. Asso	Latta	8,600 00	3,400 00	15,000 00	3,700 00	600 00		320	2	388 00
Brigham Tel. Line	Hanover			14,000 00	1,800 00	1,100 00		180	1	600 00
Brighton Municipal Tel. Co	Brighton		20,000 00	23,000 00	3,000 00	3,000 00		350	10	1,100 00
Bromley Line Tel. Asso	Bromley Line			2,200 00	651 54	627 23		43	2	210 00
Bromley Tel. Asso. No. 1	Douglas	1,624 88		1,522 78	286 67	231 02		38	1	41 50
Bromley Tel. Asso. No. 2	Douglas	1,454 04		1,386 17	120 65	96 18		28	1	57 75
Brookdale Tel. Co	Napanee			600 00	190 00	80 00		14	1	10 00
Brooke Municipal Tel. System	Inwood	4,402 00	47,200 00	47,200 00	11,771 75	4,225 00		845	4	2,380 00
Brougham & Gratton Tel. Co., Ltd	Hyndford	2,100 00		2,700 00	215 76	98 30		10	1	43 00
Bruce Municipal Tel. System	Underwood		63,200 00	92,000 00	12,700 00	4,600 00		1,000	11	4,450 00
Brussels, Morris & Grey Municipal Tel. System	Brussels		47,640 72	56,130 17	4,991 68	3,842 85		860	5	2,450 15
Burgessville Tel. Co	Woodstock	13,300 00		24,400 00	7,585 15	5,336 33		535	5	3,216 24
Burnt River Tel. Co	Burnt River	4,030 00		6,300 00	500 00	500 00		102	2	500 00
Byron Tel. Co., Ltd	Delaware	14,070 00		14,070 00	4,315 00	3,760 14		546	4	2,989 65
"C" Tel. Line (Municipal)	Sea Gull			200 00	40 00	40 00		8		
Cadman & Milling Private Line	Napanee			1,750 00	400 00	200 00		31		
Calabogie & Renfrew Tel. Asso	Ashdad	4,265 55		4,400 00	1,409 17	1,338 07		28	2	115 00
Cambray Tel. Union	Cambray			450 00	373 02	367 08		300	1	25 00
Camden Independent Tel. Co	Newburgh	4,250 00		9,500 00	1,961 58	1,193 19		200	4	400 00
Caradoc-Ekfrid Tel. Co., Ltd	Melbourne	10,000 00		16,000 00	1,410 00	374 80		582		
Cameron Tel. Union	Cameron			4,441 95	223 45	220 57		92	1	182 00
Canadian Machine Tel. Co., Ltd	Toronto	250,000 00		338,690 98	16,181 55	16,037 54	‡815	393	27	14,518 90
Cannon Tel. Line	Sharbot Lake			2,000 00	200 00	100 00		30		
Carlsruhe Tel. Co	Carlsruhe	250 00		250 00	60 00	40 00		4	1	15 00
Carholme & Walsingham Tel. Co	Walsingham	140 00	140 00	130 00	15 00	15 00		15	1	15 00
Central Dufferin Tel. Asso., Ltd	Shelburne	1,180 00		1,180 00	284 75	220 25		31	3	135 00
Central Tel. Line	Richards Landing			450 00	72 00	72 00		18		

*These figures relate to Ontario only. †Estimated. ‡Automatic.

TABLE 1.—Statement of Capital, Cost, Revenue, Operating Expenses, Number of Telephones, Employees, etc.—*Continued.*

Name of Company.	Address.	Capital Stock.	Funded Debt.	Cost Property and Equipment	Revenue.	Operating Expenses.	Number of Telephones.		Employees and Remuneration.	
							Central.	Magneto	No.	Amount.
Ontario—Con.		$ cts.	$ cts.	$ cts.	$ cts.	$ cts.				$ cts.
Centre Road Tel. Club	Annan			1,578 44	227 63	227 05		21		
Centre Thorah Tel. Asso	Beaverton	200 00		200 00	57 00	45 00		9		
Chamberlain Private Line	Wheatley			5,500 00	2,690 00	1,736 40		172		
Champlain Point Tel. System	Orillia			80 00	50 00	50 00		9		
Chatsworth Rutal Tel. Co	Chatsworth	5,736 37		5,728 05	1,365 48	650 16		110	2	173 56
Chelmsford Tel. Co	Chelmsford	5,000 00		5,000 00	845 45	564 00		42	2	250 00
Chinquacousy Local Tel Co	Cheltenham		30,000 00	33,000 00	13,439 82	10,219 97		509	4	2,796 00
Chippawa Hill Tel. Co	Southampton			1,178 60	345 30	345 30		21		93 50
Cochrane Tel. Co	Cobalt	25,000 00		16,309 72	4,614 80	2,290 92		116	4	2,101 51
Coe Hill Rural Tel. Co	Coe Hill			6,850 00	786 05	585 83		*53	11	275 00
Colborne Municipal Tel. System	Benmiller		7,350 00	7,350 00	831 00	630 00		135	2	295 00
Colchester North Tel. System	Essex		11,892 00	12,156 00	2,840 00	1,130 00		284	1	250 00
Coldstream Tel. System	Coldstream	13,000 00		13,200 00	2,000 00	800 00		234	3	800 00
Conn Tel. Co., Ltd	Conn	3,270 00		5,000 00	985 00	440 00		120	2	168 00
Consolidated Tel. Co	Caledon	29,426 25	3,600 00	55,530 00	9,492 12	8,486 51		538	10	3,895 00
Coulson-Jarratt Tel. System	Jarratt		900 00	2,500 00	288 00	175 00		46		
Crews Tel. Line	Trenton			480 00	63 40	63 40		8		
Crown Hill Mutual Tel. Asso	Barrie	3,500 00		3,213 86	540 50	510 58		68	2	52 00
Crediton Rural Tel. System	Crediton			10,500 00	1,900 00	1,100 00		184	2	475 00
Dawn Municipal Tel. System	Dresden		12,815 00	13,508 00	1,165 97	1,194 88		260	4	850 00
Delphi, Thornbury & Clarksburg Tel. Co	Camperdown			365 00	67 73	55 69		6	1	5 00
Derby Tel. Asso	Owen Sound	1,585 00	600 00	4,500 00	1,552 36	948 43		100	3	142 50
Dereham Tel. Co., Ltd	Brownsville	12,000 00		12,858 89	4,718 46	3,934 05		283	8	1,251 95
Desboro Tel. System	Desboro			4,836 00	742 79	734 35		102		30 00
Doane Tel. Co	Newmarket			900 00	328 00	235 00		21		
Dover Municipal Tel. System	Bear Line			10,879 00	1,296 00	1,296 00		216	1	150 00
Dresden Tel. Co	Dresden			25,459 00	6,208 12	3,552 19		404	7	2,836 29
Drummond Centre Tel. Asso	Perth	5,000 00		5,000 00	612 67	407 29		83	2	210 00
Dunville Consolidated Tel. Co., Ltd	Dunville	70,000 00	24,000 00	77,419 66	19,068 08	9,164 33	309	788	14	6,928 00
Dunsford Tel. Light & Power Ass	Dunsford	3,200 00		5,000 00	1,300 00	700 00		113	3	400 00
Dunwich & Dutton Tel. Asso., Ltd	Dutton	3,810 00		4,500 00	1,611 58	1,360 90		214	2	415 15
Durham Union Tel. Co	Orono			10,500 00	1,130 82	973 16		279	2	706 72
East Darlington Tel. Asso	Bowmanville	140 00		140 00	64 00	64 00		8		

East Grey Tel. Co.	Markdale	790 00		5,000 00	600 00	600 00		50	3	500 00
East Luther Tel. Co.	Grand Valley	1,600 00	3,000 00	2,600 00	1,036 00	911 00		190	2	470 00
East Middlesex Tel. Co., Ltd.	Thorndale	8,680 00		21,983 74	5,584 31	4,988 65		360	4	1,450 00
East Woodville Tel. Asso.	Woodville	495 00		495 00	95 00	95 00		12		10 00
Eden Tel. Co.	Woodville	1,950 00		1,950 00	100 00	100 00		60	1	100 00
Edenvale Tel. Co.	Edenvale			200 00	42 00	42 00		14	1	42 00
Edgar Tel. Line	Bowling Green			7,000 00	1,700 00	300 00		340	1	200 00
Edville & Dundonald Tel Co.	Colborne			3,475 00	1,024 00	724 00		80	2	384 00
Elderslie—Salem Tel. Asso.	Dobbinton	945 00		945 00	17 15	13 03		21	1	5 00
Eldon Union Tel. Asso.	Beaverton	2,120 00		2,120 00	320 68	262 15		43	1	59 15
Elmsley South Tel. Co.	Lombardy	500 00	2,850 00	3,300 00	430 50	98 15		37	2	181 15
Elgin—Chaffey's Lock Tel. Co.	Chaffey's Lock	800 00		800 00	74 00	31 00		2	2	25 00
Elizabeth Bay Mutual Tel. Co.	Elizabeth Bay	318 00		318 00	12 50	12 50		10	2	12 50
Ellis Rural Tel. Co.	Cannington			246 75	41 00	41 00		10		
Emo Municipal Tel. Co.	Emo		9,000 00	9,000 00				98		
Enterprise Tel. Asso.	Steelton			300 00	50 00	50 00		5		
Enterprise Tel. Co.	Enterprise			1,300 00	140 00	50 00		25	1	30 00
Erie Tel. Co., Ltd.	Selkirk	26,100 00	13,805 32	85,000 00	14,999 83	8,730 40		1,200	21	6,510 12
Ernst Private Line	New Hamburg			17,600 00	3,700 00	1,700 00		237	6	1,300 00
Euphrasia Municipal Tel. System	Markdale			8,650 00	1,095 00	996 56		107	1	180 00
Evergreen Tel Co.	Douglas	500 00		500 00	16 00	16 00		8		
Falkirk Co-op. Tel. Asso.	Denfield	8,000 00		13,000 00	1,200 00	800 00		240	6	500 00
Fall River Tel. Asso.	Maberly	555 00		500 00	25 00	25 00		30		
Fairview Tel. Co.	Antem Mills			3,000 00	50 00	50 00		8		10 00
Fairview Tel. Asso.	Woodstock			350 00	61 00	61 00		9		
Farmers' Union Telephone Co.	Richards Landing	600 00			60 00	60 00		18		
Fenelon Falls Tel. Asso.	Fenelon Falls	800 00		1,100 00	150 42	64 80		18		
Fenelon Rural Tel. Asso.	Cameron			613 26	77 48	77 48		13	1	16 20
Fenella Rural Tel. Co., Ltd.	Fenella	1,950 00		1,950 00	235 00	165 00		55	1	65 00
Fifth Line Telephone Club.	Bognor	1,000 00		1,000 00	75 00	75 00		15		
Fingal Tel. Co., Ltd.	Fingal	3,030 00		5,050 00	3,729 32	3,474 36		238	4	538 35
Floss Municipal Tel. Co.	Elmvale		28,500 00	28,500 00	1,101 92	877 42		432	3	776 54
Fordwich Rural Tel. Co.	Fordwich	6,200 00		6,300 00	1,714 38	1,046 56		139	2	160 00
Forest Home Tel. Co.	Orilla			1,500 00	88 80	88 80		16		
Fort Frances Municipal Tel. Co.	Fort Frances		23,000 00	20,131 92	6,176 47	5,125 44		198	5	2,547 50
Fort William Tel. Co., Corp. of.	Fort William		390,000 00	365,000 00	64,210 70	32,995 33	2,350		45	16,625 00
Fourth Line Tel. Asso.	Perth	81 44		135 00	32 05	32 05		3		
Fourth Line Tel. Asso.	Cobden			357 63	72 29	72 29		16		
Fourteenth of Brant Tel. Co.	Chesley			450 00	54 26	53 30		11		2 50
Frasier Tel. Asso.	Woodstock	400 00		400 00	30 00	30 00		14		
Fretts & Brisco Co-op. Tel. Line	Napanee			300 00	43 15	42 80		6		
Fingerboard Tel. Line	Sonya			380 00	60 00	60 00		20		
Gamas & Shore Road Bay Tel. Line	Gamas Bay			1,046 00	66 00	66 00		22	1	66 00
Germanicus Tel. Asso.	Germanicus	791 80		786 95	15 05	15 05		21	1	15 05
Gillies Hill Tel. Asso.	Chesley			296 39	116 05	111 21		16		10 00
Gillis Private Line	Tobermory			5,000 00	700 00	140 00	*	100	3	140 00
Glaister Tel. System	Wellesley			18,000 00	3,000 00	1,800 00		280	3	1,050 00
Glandine Central Line	Little Britain			488 44	140 83	140 83		19	1	20 00

*Four automatic signalling

TABLE 1.—Statement of Capital, Cost, Revenue, Operating Expenses, Number of Telephones, Employees, etc.—*Continued.*

Name of Company.	Address.	Capital Stock.	Funded Debt.	Cost Property and Equipment.	Revenue.	Operating Expenses.	Number of Telephones.		Employees and Remuneration.	
							Central.	Magneto	No.	Amount.
Ontario—Con.		$ cts.	$ cts.	$ cts.	$ cts.	$ cts.				$ cts.
Glasgow Tel. System	Connamore			30,000 00	4,200 00	1,600 00		340	6	400 00
Glen Eden Tel. Club	Owen Sound	640 00		480 00	106 00	106 00		16	1	15 00
Glen Tel. Asso	Bethany	364 00		364 00	13 00	13 00		13		
Glengarry Co-op. Tel. Co	Alexandria	12,000 00		14,000 00	3,409 29	1,420 95	230		2	935 65
Gloucester Township Tel. Asso	Carlsbad Springs			575 00				14		
Goderich Rural Tel. Co., Ltd	Dungannon	5,000 00	37,598 62	48,531 93	6,955 43	5,725 16		525	4	2,200 00
Goderich Township Muni. Tel. System	Clinton			11,500 00	1,500 00	1,400 00		227	1	540 00
Gordon Tel. Co	Foxey			300 00	114 00	114 00		23	1	10 00
Gore Mutual Tel. Asso	Harrow			857 98	79 58	79 58		12	1	12 00
Gosfield North Municipal Tel. Asso	Cottam		12,356 00	12,356 00	3,219 50	1,200 00		285	3	850 00
Goulais Bay Tel. Club	Goulais River	2,849 92		2,766 74	304 00	122 26		19	2	43 00
Green Hill Tel. Co	Markdale	500 00		700 00	168 00	66 00		14		
Greenwood Tel. Club	Steelton			400 00	75 50	62 00		9		8 00
Greenwood Tel. System	Sutton West			450 00	300 00	200 00		24		
Grunwall Tel. Line	Huntsville			515 38	110 00	94 30		6		
Guest Private Line	Douglas	300 00		300 00	15 00	15 00		2		
Haldimand Rural Tel. Co	Grafton	1,320 00		6,575 00	780 00	460 00		144	2	302 50
Halton Tel. Co., Ltd	Hornby	10 000 00		15,500 00	4,331 27	3,566 00		235	3	1,100 00
Haley's Station Tel. Asso	Haley's Station			950 00	90 00	90 00		23		19 00
Hamilton Tel. Line	Bethany			575 00	93 00	93 00				
Hamilton Rural Tel. Co	Cold Springs	910 00		2,030 00	1,626 08	1,054 49		208	1	500 00
Hartley Tel. Co	Hartley			600 00	25 83	23 84		16		
Harvey's Municipal Tel. System	Peterboro			3,264 16	402 40	445 20		48	2	176 75
Harrietsville Tel. Asso., Ltd	Harrietsville	10,870 00		12,565 00	5,748 55	5,326 39		410	14	3,152 54
Harwood Rural Tel. Co	Harwood	1,062 00		1,000 00	111 83	110 98		30	1	18 00
Hawthorn Hill Rural Tel. Co., Ltd	Palmerston	880 00		8,000 00	2,163 00	1,592 00		158	3	550 00
Hay Township Municipal Tel. System	Zurich		21,655 74	21,655 74	6,103 00	2,200 00		459	4	2,310 00
Hazeldean Rural Tel. Co., Ltd	Hazeldean	11,760 00		20 000 00	3,913 32	3,604 25		200	4	1,300 00
Henderson's Private Line	Cannington			800 00	218 00	128 00		24		10 70
Heric Tel. Line	St. Clements	1,800 00		1,800 00	450 00	150 00		40	1	100 00
Highland Tel. Co., Ltd	Ruskview	2,500 00		3,500 00	879 87	741 52		57	1	159 42
Highland Tel. Co	Milberta			4,400 00	900 97	881 87		92	3	461 00
Hinton & Jocelyn Tel. Co	Carterton			1,000 00	101 71	86 51		15	1	60 00
Hoath Head & Grey Tel. Co	Owen Sound			1,300 00	162 00	155 00		31	1	3 00

Hollow Glen Tel. Co	Breckenridge			560 00				10		
Hopetown Tel. Asso	Hopetown	4,500 00		6,100 00	2,091 40	1,560 11		168	6	709 00
Hoover Tel. Co	Nanticoke	150 00		150 00	9 80	8 00		3		
Horton & McNab Tel. Asso., Ltd	Braeside	2,450 00	2,500 00	2,450 00	1,000 00	875 00		107	1	625 00
Houghton & Bayham Tel. Co., Ltd	Fairground	2,320 00		2,600 00	1,177 10	1,140 37		169	9	528 36
Houghton, Bayham & Tilsonbury Tel. Asso	Kinglake	1,600 00		2,800 00	664,00	400 00		126	2	400 00
Houghton & South Walsingham Tel. Co.	Clear Creek	1,000 00		1,000 00	296 65	281 78		50	2	60 00
Huron & Kinloss Municipal Tel. System	Ripley		45,700 00	45,700 00	4,129 73	2,913 02		629	5	2,574 99
Hyndman's Private Line	Exeter			2,700 00	684 00	275 00		57	1	125 00
Huntsville & Portage Tel. Co	Huntsville			5,770 25	1,008 71	884 37		31	2	233 49
Ice Lake Tel. Co	Ice Lake			1,325 00	100 00	100 00		29		
Indian River Tel. Co	Pembroke			490 00	50 00	42 70		7		
Ingersoll Tel. Co., Ltd	Ingersoll	36,200 00	35,000 00	110,630 43	18,495 46	12,722 51		1,209	18	6,922 57
Ingliside Tel. Asso	Woodstock			650 00	148 66	156 15		13	1	9 50
Innerkip Rural Tel. Co	Lefroy	18,240 00	7,000 00	33,270 40	6,788 35	3,750 64		525	6	2,224 66
Innisfil Tel. Asso	Lefroy	4,150 00		3,950 00	1,178 45	883 81		83	2	86 00
Islay Tel. Co	Woodville			1,700 00	301 50	40 00		40	1	15 00
Ivy-Thorton Tel. Co., Ltd	Ivy	3,575 00		3,000 00	1,341 00	926 00		141	1	541 00
Jackson Tel. Co., Ltd	Owen Sound	1,640 00		2,600 00	945 00	811 03		76		
Johnston (Dr.) Private Line	Jannetsville							40		
Johnson Municipal Tel. System	Port Lock	1,615 54	3,029 40	4,543 14	1,425 30	1,207 33		81	2	450 00
Kaladar & Northern Tel. Co	Northbrook	1,400 00		1,400 00	225 00	130 00		16	1	110 00
Kenora (Town of) Tel. System	Kenora		25,782 51	39,917 64	11,436 95	6,373 58	528	2	9	3,429 90
Kerr Line Tel. Asso	Forresters Falls			1,300 00	182 27	182 27		38	2	87 45
King Tel. Co., Ltd	King	5,060 00	2,260 00	10,500 00	2,950 00	2,300 00		230	2	1,200 00
Kingston Road Rural Tel. Asso	Grafton			300 00	117 00	117 00		9		
Kitley Rural Tel. Co., Ltd	New Bliss	11,300 00	3,250 00	11,043 75	2,250 96	2,051 91		247	4	1,075 95
Korah Central Tel. Asso	Sault Ste Marie West			700 00	112 00	112 00		12	1	5 00
Koshee-Sparrow Lake Private Line	Sparrow Lake			600 00	71 50	71 50		8	1	12 00
Lake of Bays & Haliburton Tel. Co	Baysville	3,000 00		2,765 00	489 00	518 52		42	4	385 00
Lake Shore Tel. Asso	Kincardine	1,400 00		1,400 00	159 50	129 50		37	2	22 00
Laird Municipal Tel. Asso	Bar River		2,887 36	6,890 00	1,113 72	724 43		147	3	632 10
Lambton Tel. Co., Ltd	Sombra	9,750 00		14,864 80	1,715 85	1,027 00		178	3	877 00
Lambeth Tel. Co., Ltd	Lambeth	2,400 00		3,500 00	480 00	100 00		18		
Lanark & Carleton Counties Tel. Co., Ltd	Almonte	17,200 00		19,832 80	3,974 75	3,984 45		301	6	2,878 80
Lanark & Ramsay Tel. Asso	Carleton Place			2,000 00	135 00	100 00		18	1	50 00
Lansdowne Rural Tel. Co., Ltd	Lansdowne	17,100 00		15,100 00	4,149 46	3,985 01		354	3	1,234 00
Lavant-Dalhousie Tel. Asso	Poland	3,000 00	50 00	3,500 00	856 47	736 83		54	4	195 00
La Vallee Municipal Tel. Asso	Devlin		7,813 26	7,813 26	101 08	75 00		116	1	75 00
Lee Valley Tel. Co	Lee Valley	1,200 00		1,300 00	50 00	50 00		26	1	50 00
Leeds & Frontenac Rural Tel. Co., Ltd	Seeleys Bay	23,000 00		23,000 00	6,394 73	5,293 26		470		
Leeds & Grenville Indep. Tel. Co. Ltd	North Augusta	19,150 00	4,100 00	33,744 60	2,135 05	2,549 98		600	10	2,150 00
Leith & Annan Tel. Club	Leith	1,462 00		3,338 87	974 43	799 81		81	1	217 00
Lennox Tel. Co. Ltd	Napanee	1,410 00		6,000 00	1,280 41	615 56		85	1	275 00
Lighting Tel. Asso	Gratton			1,324 00	140 00	80 00		23		
Little Britain Tel. Union	Little Britain			300 00	818 07	788 25			3	454 00
Long Lake Rural Tel. Co	Long Lake			6,500 00	900 00	500 00		112	2	250 00
Lucknow & Kinloss Tel. Asso	Ripley			1,000 00	90 00	50 00		11	1	10 00

TABLE 1.—Statement of Capital, Cost, Revenue, Operating Expenses, Number of Telephones, Employees, etc.—*Continued.*

Name of Company.	Address.	Capital Stock.	Funded Debt.	Cost of Property and Equipment.	Revenue.	Operating Expenses.	Number of Telephones.		Employees and Remuneration.	
							Central.	Magneto	No.	Amount.
Ontario—Con.		$ cts.	$ cts.	$ cts.	$ cts.	$ cts.				$ cts.
Lyons Private Line	Markdale			1,110 00	343 20	115 00		24		
Lyndhurst Rural Tel. Co. Ltd	Lyndhurst	1,000 00	3,150 00	10,300 00	1,900 00	725 00		195	4	675 00
Lyndock Curlholme & Walsingham Centre Tel. Co	Lyndock	270 00	100 00	450 00	22 00	24 75		11	1	24 00
Madawaska Tel. Asso	Burnstown	955 00		1,890 00	779 33	699 27		58	2	125 00
Maidstone Municipal Tel. System	Maidstone		13,974 19	15,279 15	3,223 46	1,620 03		380	3	675 00
Malahide & Bayham Tel. Asso	Straffordville	7,425 00		8,400 00	2,722 15	2,667 26		410	8	1,749 22
Mallorytown Indep. Tel. Co	Mallorytown		14,100 00	22,625 00	1,728 72	1,234 49		290	2	600 00
Manitoulin & N. Shore Teleg. & Tel. Co	Little Current	13,000 00		17,000 00	2,800 00	1,800 00		35	5	1,500 00
Manitoulin Rural Tel. Co	Mindemoya	3,870 00		7,045 50	739 75	402 63		177	6	300 00
Manilla Northern Tel. Co	Woodville			3,000 00	10 00	10 00		69	1	5 00
Manse Grove Tel. Co	Lorneville			1,500 00	260 00	250 00		39	1	15 00
Maple Grove Tel. Co	Shallow Lake	398 00		564 95	44 75	43 80		12	1	5 00
Maple Leaf Tel. Co	Oakwood			665 00	44 08	44 08		19	1	44 08
Maple Shade Tel. Co	Woodstock			175 00	55 00	55 00		8		
Mariposa Tel. Union	Oakwood			650 00	650 00	625 00		168	2	450 00
Martintown Tel. Co	Martintown	2,050 00	1,900 00	6,542 25	1,254 00	471 76		109	2	335 00
Marysburgh Tel. Co	Milford	10,000 00		10,000 00	1,600 00	400 00		125	2	300 00
Marmion Tel. Co	Marmion	663 38		663 38	6 00	6 00		24		
Massey Station Tel. Co. Ltd	Spanish Mills	500 00		600 00	190 95	208 07		4	4	71 88
Matchedash Tel. System	Coldwater			2,663 00	550 40	168 00		41		
Meath Tel. Asso	Cobden			2,270 90	287 30	287 30		29	1	5 50
Medonte Municipal Tel. System	Moonstone		1,500 00	17,982 38	3,586 58	3,418 44		350	3	641 22
Melancthon Tel. Asso	Corbetton	2,050 00	350 00	2,400 00	123 95	85 00		42	1	25 00
Meek Private Line	Port Rowan			175 00	15 00	15 00		5	1	
Metcalfe Rural Tel. Co. Ltd	Metcalfe	15,900 00	20,000 00	15,000 00	4,000 00	1,675 00		335	4	1,345 00
Mills Tel. Co	Thamesford			7,000 00	1,000 00	900 00		99	3	360 00
Minesing Tel. Asso	Minesing			3,600 00	520 00	520 00		93		
Minto Rural Tel. Co. Ltd	Harriston	3,050 00		6,375 00	1,188 30	758 38		159	1	86 50
Mississippi Tel. Co. Ltd	Lanark	2,472 15		4,097 81	1,134 00	694 00		93	3	283 00
Molesworth Independent Tel. Co. Ltd	Wroxeter	990 00		3,200 00	815 00	475 00		75	3	325 00
Monk Tel. Co. Ltd	Carp	30,000 00		25,000 00	7,877 49	6,898 51		448	5	2,609 00
Monteith-Dempsey Rural Tel. Co	Stratford	5,200 00		5,200 00	1,275 00	650 00		86	1	600 00

Mono Mills Tel. Co	Mono Mills			5,000 00	760 00	740 00		130	3	535 00
Moorsburg-Desboro Tel. Asso	Desboro			210 00	65 70	65 70		12		
Moore Municipal Tel. Co	Brigden		33,225 00	46,232 00	9,619 09	5,522 85		754	9	3,100 00
Moore & Moore Private Line	Brooklin			1,000 00	100 00	44 00		15		
Mornington & Wellesley Tel. Asso. Ltd	Millbank	3,980 00	12,000 00	9,100 00	1,534 92	1,158 67		136	4	670 84
Mount Albert Tel. Co. Ltd	Mount Albert	3,610 00		16,900 00	5,245 67	3,814 70		485	6	1,825 00
Mount Forest, Wellington & Grey Tel. Co. Ltd	Mount Forest	5,026 50		6,091 74	1,228 39	876 20		108	1	50 00
Mount Plea ant Tel. Co	Castleton			8,000 00	2,500 00	1,650 00		280	5	
Moscow Mutual Tel. Asso	Moscow			2,800 00	104 00	104 00		65		
Murray-Brighton Tel. Co	Wooler			16,000 00	2,975 24	610 10		204	1	120 00
Muskoka Indep. Tel. System	Martin Siding			3,000 00	754 84	658 19		60	3	218 59
Muskoka, Victoria & Haliburton Tel Co	Oppington	1,500 00		3,374 87	396 25	12 00		25	1	12 00
Muskoka River Tel. System	Alport			400 00	49 00	49 00		7	1	7 00
Muskrat Tel. Co	Cobden			635 62	145 34	145 34		19		
Mutual Tel. Asso	Orillia			343 90	63 90	63 90		10		
MacDonald Rural Tel. Co	Sylvan Valley		2,500 00	3,000 00	182 60	182 60		70	3	175 00
McDonald Tel. Co	Trenton			1,965 00	155 00	155 00		19		
McEachern Tel. Co	Linwood			4,000 00	1,115 00	395 00		78	3	345 00
McGillicuddy & Zavitz Tel. Co	Watford			300 00	25 00	12 00		5		
McHardy Private Line	Merlin			600 00	350 00	225 00		26	2	550 00
McKenzie Tel. Co	Chatsworth	1,000 00		1,000 00	208 00	100 00		16		
McKillop, Logan & Herbert Tel. Co. Ltd	Staffa	13,865 00	8,900 00	19,953 15	5,463 59	4,061 30		400	10	1,987 20
McKillop Tel. System	Seaforth			27,675 00	6,059 00	5,609 00		350	2	350 00
McNab Tel. Asso	Arnprior	1,700 00		1,900 00	350 00	175 00		39	3	150 00
Nelson Tel. Co. Ltd	Milton	10,000 00	9,000 00	24,500 00	3,400 00	2,100 00		237	3	1,350 00
New California Rural Tel. Co	Kingsville			2,400 00	540 00	540 00		59		
New Dundee Tel. Co. Ltd	New Dundee	4,280 00		8,416 75	2,950 00	1,084 65		179	2	710 00
New Glasgow Tel. Co. Ltd	Rodney	2,520 00		4,000 00	1,498 56	1,415 70		130	3	132 00
Niagara District Tel. Co. Ltd	Jordan Station	16,300 00		27,121 00	5,101 56	5,093 71		517	9	3,588 65
Ninth Line of Cavan Tel. Co	Bethany			386 00	5 00	5 00		10		
Nissouri Tel. Co. Ltd	Thamesford	3,670 00		7,650 00	1,899 75	1,419 67		162	4	650 00
Noble Tel. Line	Sutton West			350 00	30 00	20 00		6		
Noisy River Tel. Co. Ltd	Glencairn	16,927 00		30,421 67	7,592 76	4,494 21		495	2	1,628 77
Norfolk County Tel. Co. Ltd	Waterford	43,300 00	12,500 00	84,863 18	25,778 77	16,410 51		1,365	14	7,158 90
Norfolk & Tilsonburg Tel. Asso. Ltd	Tillsonburg	5,835 00		9,000 00	2,408 00	1,940 52		252	5	876 00
Norland Independent Tel. Co	Coboconk			1,600 00	173 75	158 75		37		
North Bonnechere Tel. Asso	Renfrew			800 00	75 00	75 00		13		
North Brant Tel. Asso	Elmwood			1,600 00	297 00	302 30		39	1	15 00
Northcot Farmers Tel. Co	Northcot	1,175 00		1,175 00	84 00	84 00		45	1	84 00
North East Clark Tel. Line	Oak			950 00	95 00	95 00		22	1	15 00
North Easthope Municipal Tel. System	Shakespeare		25,748 34	24,930 00	4,039 41	3,328 58		404	4	1,648 46
North Elderslie Tel. Asso	Dobbington			2,411 88	313 88	276 90		36	1	10 00
Northern Mutual Tel. Co	Marmora			2,420 00	90 00	21 00		35		
Northern Tel. Co	Korah	1,125 00		1,105 00	151 47	151 47		13		
North Horton Tel. Co	Renfrew	1,310 00		1,100 00	205 38	37 93		43	1	18 95
North Huron Tel. Co. Ltd	Wingham	20,000 00	2,450 36	24,940 35	5,566 34	3,434 26		442		

TABLE 1.—Statement of Capital, Cost, Revenue, Operating Expenses, Number of Telephones, Employees, etc.—*Continued.*

Name of Company.	Address.	Capital Stock.	Funded Debt.	Cost of Property and Equipment.	Revenue.	Operating Expenses.	Number of Telephones.		Employees and Remuneration.	
							Central.	Magneto	No.	Amount.
Ontario—Con.		$ cts.	$ cts	$ cts.	$ cts.	$ cts				$ cts.
North Renfrew Tel. Co	Beachburg	1,600 00		1,700 00	711 71	711 71		45	2	439 12
North Wellington Tel. Co. Ltd	Arthur	5,632 00		8,060 00	1,484 55	1,150 69		117	4	479 38
Oak Flats & Vernon Tel. Co	Godfrey			740 00				13		
Oldfields Tel. Co	Dundalk	250 00		250 00	80 00	40 00		8		
Oliver Municipal Tel. Csso	Murillo	3,813 54		8,145 00	3,339 74	1,408 69		101	3	525 00
Omemee Tel. Co	Omemee	1,542 00		1,924 00	512 00	224 00		41		96 00
Oro Tel. Co. Ltd	Oro Station	6,375 00		10,917 56	3,549 43	3,417 56		214	5	705 55
Orr-Stienhoff Tel. Asso	Chesley	408 81		408 81	7 10	1 18		19		
Osceola Tel. Asso	Osceola			1,000 00	64 00	64 00		16		
Osprey Municipal Tel. System	Maxwell		9,500 00	9,500 00	1,325 78	1,084 94		165	2	626 00
Otonabee Municipal Tel. System	Keene							130		
Ottawa Hunt Club Tel. Asso	Billings Bridge	600 00			120 00	120 00		7		
Ottawa Valley Rural Tel. Co	Kars	2,300 00	3,700 00	6,000 00	1,200 00	200 00		100	3	200 00
Palace Road Mutual Tel. Asso	Napanee			1,620 00	267 55	5 00		32		5 00
Palestine Tel. Co	Woodville			1,900 00	81 00	81 00		30	2	81 00
Park Head Tel. Co	Park Head	800 00		800 00	115 00	115 00		21	2	10 00
Parkhill Rural Tel. Co	Parkhill	8,077 16		8,077 16	1,837 22	764 48		173	3	319 73
Pastime Tel. Co	Cobden			1,000 00	76 25	76 25		13	1	60 00
Paul & Eckert Tel. System	Sebringville			21,750 00	3,797 88	3,797 00		310		
Peabody Tel. Co	Chesley			750 00	100 00	100 00		17		
Peerless Tel. Asso	Woodstock			190 00	60 25	60 25		7		
Pefferlaw Private Tel. Co	Pefferlaw			3,000 00	650 00	400 00		100	1	150 00
Pelee Island Municipal Tel. System	Pelee Island		6,248 12	6,248 12	1,246 60	1,246 60		90	2	808 36
Penhurst Tel. Asso	Woodstock			305 40	73 49	73 69		10		
Peoples Mutual Tel. Co. Ltd	Pieton	7,700 00		7,485 00	1,255 00	675 00		271	1	525 00
Peoples Tel. Co. of Forest Ltd	Forest	7,780 00	2,650 00	15,200 00	5,358 47	5,097 60		343	6	2,623 30
Peoples Tel. & Teleg. Co. Ltd	Maynooth	13,700 00		17,199 67	2,745 93	2,773 45		163	22	1,451 72
Perth & Christies Lake Tel. Asso	Perth	1,365 00		1,537 83	320 96	318 65		63	2	77 59
Perreton Tel. Co	Pembroke			1,500 00	170 00	170 00		21	1	170 00
Pine Grove Tel. Asso	Orillia			525 00	92 55	66 50		12		
Pioneer Tel. Co. Ltd	Thornloe	5,005 00		5,908 67	1,401 15	1,376 80		95	2	820 75
Pioneer Tel. Asso	Woodstock			400 00	169 37	165 00		18		
Plum Hollow & Eloida Tel. Co	Athens	5,000 00		8,000 00	1,808 47	1,715 91		128	2	1,000 00
Plummer, Aberdeen & Galbraith Tel. Co	Ohpir	1,576 50		1,378 63	95 59	95 59		18	1	35 50

Pontypool Tel., Lt. & Power Co.	Pontypool	500 00		850 00	156 56	127 05		31		
Port Hope Tel. Co. Ltd	Clarke	8,820 00		15,617 50	2,491 05	1,267 50		251	3	928 00
Porcupine Tel. Lines Ltd	Cobalt	30,000 00		32,835 46	11,459 33	7,088 55		180	8	5,846 04
Port Arthur Municipal Tel. Dept	Port Arthur		337,500 00	337,378 13	49,461 01	26,920 37	2,552		55	22,248 41
Port Rowan Rural Tel. Co	Port Rowan		498 50	1,550 00	750 00	750 00		152	1	370 00
Port Stanley Tel. Co	Port Stanley	610 00		700 00	404 85	350 08		45	1	75 00
Princeton & Drumbo Tel. Co. Ltd	Princeton	20,000 00	9,800 00	33,900 00	7,450 63	3,878 45		551	7	2,048 00
Progressive Agriculture Tel. System	Sault Ste. Marie			1,000 00	48 00	48 00		14	2	45 00
Queens Line Tel. Asso	Queens Line	700 00		700 00	55 30	120 00		19	2	17 50
Quinlan Tel. Asso	Stratford	6,000 00		6,000 00	1,650 00	675 00		101	1	165 00
Rainy River International Tel. Co	Rainy River	23,875 00		22,746 22	4,061 75	4,200 78		68	4	2,520 00
Rankin Tel. Co	Pembroke	2,000 00		2,000 00	440 00	100 00		44	3	75 00
Ravenscliffe Tel. Co., Ltd	Ravenscliffe	2,346 00		2,220 17	493 10	325 45		44	2	95 60
Raymond Tel. Asso	Raymond	1,078 00		1,032 50				14		
Reid Private Line	Westmeath			1,000 00	100 00	3 00		2		
Richardsons Private Line	Nipissing			1,525 00	250 00	100 00		4		
Richards Landing Tel. Club	Richards Landing			1,000 00	60 00	60 00		20		
Rideau View Tel. Asso	Billings Bridge			475 45	224 00	204 00		13		
Riverside Tel. Co	Woodstock			417 80	68 19	68 19		8		
Riverdale Tel. Asso	Napanee	450 00		450 00	109 00	89 00		11		
Rochester Municipal Tel. Asso	South Woodslee		16,050 00	16,884 12	4,075 00	2,862 62		430	7	1,567 00
Roch Fendue Tel. Co	Beachburg			925 00	95 00	95 00		17		
Robison Tel. Co	Silverwater	835 00		835 00	10 00	10 00		30		
Rockwood & Oustic Tel. Co	Rockwood	2,800 00		4,100 00	1,028 00	749 86		73	2	103 45
Romney Tel. System	Wheatley			1,000 00	238 00	130 00		23	1	12 00
Rose Tel. Co., Ltd	Rydal Bank	1,200 00		1,460 00	175 00	90 00		13	2	50 00
Rox Tel. Co	Cobden			800 00	67 00	67 00		17		
Rosedale Tel. Co	Sydenham			870 87	68 85	56 04		15	1	4 50
Rosedale Rural Tel. Co	Fenelon Falls	760 00		1,100 00	26 05			19		
Roxborough Ind. Tel. Co	Sandringham	6,700 00	7,060 00	13,381 40	2,306 41	1,626 66		220	4	750 00
Russell Tel. System	Bailieboro	2,500 00		2,500 00	600 00	350 00		100	2	200 00
Russell Tel. Co	Navan	8,500 00		9,000 00	2,000 00	650 00		200	4	650 00
Renfrew & Shamrock Tel. Co	Shamrock	1,617 50		1,552 25	97 02	38 13		14	1	15 00
Salem Tel. Asso	Bowmanville			300 00	35 00	35 00		5		
Salkeld-Andrews Tel. Co	Goderich	115 00		115 00	65 00	60 00		6		
Sandwich South Municipal Tel. System	Maidstone		13,556 61	15,885 00	2,664 95	2,920 69		273	3	492 50
Sandwich West Tel. Asso	Loiselleville	3,000 00	1,900 00	5,500 00	1,459 56	1,064 00		73	2	300 00
Saugeen Rural Tel. Co	Southampton			200 00				8		
Saugeen Tel. Asso	Walkerton	300 00		300 00	25 00	25 00		6		
Scarboro Independent Tel. Co., Ltd	Highland Creek	8,250 00		40,000 00	4,210 45	2,810 45		465	4	1,600 00
Schomberg Tel. Co., Ltd	Schomberg	23,000 00	5,000 00	39,000 00	4,400 00	2,600 00		300	4	1,264 00
Scotch Line & Micaville Tel. Asso	Perth			1,650 00	134 25	134 25		42		
Second Line Drummond Tel. Asso	Perth	960 00		1,050 00	123 00	123 00		19		7 35
Scratch & Palmer Tel. Asso	Kingsville	200 00		200 00	50 00	50 00		7		
Selby Tel. Asso	Newburgh	2,842 17		5,560 00	1,140 00	600 00		114	1	380 00
Section Tel. Asso	Kingsville				84 00	84 00		12		
Shuniah Tel. Co	Port Arthur		14,000 00	14,632 54	2,405 20	1,000 67		101	3	732 80
Sileote Tel. Club	Annan	2,024 80		2,024 80	160 90	177 30		29	2	16 45
Shamrock Central Line	Cresswell			450 00	70 65	70 65		17		
Sidney Bell Tel. Asso	Belleville	1,300 00		1,300 00	683 00	683 00		60	1	15 00

TABLE 1.—Statement of Capital, Cost, Revenue, Operating Expenses, Number of Telephones, Employees, etc.—*Continued.*

Name of Company.	Address.	Capital Stock.	Funded Debt.	Cost of Property and Equipment	Revenue.	Operating Expenses.	Number of Telephones.		Employees and Remuneration.	
							Central.	Magneto	No.	Amount.
Ontario—Con.		$ cts.	$ cts.	$ cts	$ cts.	$ cts				$ cts.
Sitzer Tel. Co	Mitton West			180 00	48 00			9		
Slate River Local System	Slate River Valley		1,583 47	4,994 98	1,080 23	1,065 89		60	3	691 72
Snake River Tel. Asso	Cobden	2,261 44		2,261 44	465 78	357 51		49	1	40 00
Sonya Tel. Co	Cresswell			590 00	50 00	50 00		22	4	50 00
South Brant Rural Tel. Co	Walkerton	1,000 00		1,000 00	131 70	5 00		26		
South Bruce Tel. Co., Ltd	Teeswater	11,380 00	12,000 00	20,191 16	5,133 37	2,682 07		421	5	1,746 04
South Colchester Tel. Asso	Harrow	350 00		350 00	56 25	56 25		11	1	5 50
South Crosby Tel. Co	Elgin	9,250 00		20,555 79	3,785 95	669 17		347	3	1,260 24
South Diagonal Tel. Co	Owen Sound	1,130 00		2,512 50	610 75	340 00		52	2	52 00
Southwold & Dunwich Tel. Asso., Ltd	Shedden	3,760 00		4,600 00	1,550 00	1,500 00		240	4	525 00
South Elderslie Tel. Asso	Chesley			1,385 00	122 00	122 00		37	1	20 00
South Gosfield Tel. System	Kingsville			5,008 57	1,966 00	1,293 00		151		
South Leeds & Pittsburg Tel. Co	Gananoque	9,960 00	5,000 00	5,250 00	2,850 00	960 00		215	3	500 00
South Malahide Tel. Co., Ltd	Aylmer West	9,813 00		9,813 00	5,542 00	7,038 00		712	6	3,345 00
South Sissons Private Line	Bethany			400 00				32		
South McNaughton Tel. Asso	Renfrew	440 00		760 00	75 00	60 00		12		
Sparta Tel. Co., Ltd	Sparta	4,500 00		5,000 00	1,527 48	1,304 24		155	3	576 00
Springbank Tel. Co., Ltd	Fordwich	2,070 00		3,150 00	1,193 77	791 36		112	2	137 33
Spring Creek Tel. Co	Sauble Falls			400 00	60 00	60 00		20	1	8 00
Spring Creek Tel. Asso	Woodstock			200 00	58 10	56 99		7		
Sprague Tel. Co	Mountain View			19,000 00	4,500 00	3,050 00		425	5	1,600 00
Stormont Tel. Co	Aultsville	1,100 00		1,800 00	420 00	379 00		35	2	75 00
St. Johns Tel. System	London			8,000 00	2,250 00	1,578 00		223	4	1,350 00
St. Marys, Kirkton & Exeter Tel. Co	Kirkton	32,023 00		41,016 23	10,676 00	6,030 24		940	10	4,477 27
St. Marys-Medina Tel. Co., Ltd	Lakeside	4,630 00	1,600 00	10,723 41	1,933 76	1,032 98		143	3	829 60
Stratton Tel. Co	Stratton Station			2,942 00	912 25	880 00		39	3	880 00
Stroud Tel. Co., Ltd	Craigvale	7,500 00		10,400 00	1,300 00	900 00		177	5	600 00
St. Vincent Township Municipal Tel. System	Meaford		15,986 19	18,105 70	6,283 72	2,153 40		300	1	100 00
Swale Private Line	Wiarton			650 00	110 00	65 00		9		
Sullivan & Bentick Tel. Co	Chesley	2,100 00		487 50	71 00	68 00		13		
Sullivan & Elderslie Tel. Co	Chesley			600 00	69 45	65 00		13		
Sunderland Tel. Co., Ltd	Sunderland	4,000 00		4,293 25	768 75	587 20		151	3	525 88
Sunny Valley Tel. Co	Chatsworth			200 00	70 00	70 00		9		

Sutton & N. Gwillimbury Tel. Co., Ltd.	Newmarket	2,340 00	5,000 00	4,000 00	890 00	500 00		89	1	15 00
Tara-Keady Tel. Co	Tara	956 48		1,000 48	180 80	158 21		22	1	
Tarbutt Municipal Tel. System	MacLennan			1,316 00	195 00	195 00		61	3	135 00
Tarentorus Tel. Co., Ltd	Sault Ste. Marie	5,000 00		1,100 00	300 00	156 00		19	1	32 00
Tay Municipal Tel. System	Victoria Harbour	3,125 12	9,500 00	9,326 64	788 30	775 00		175	4	775 00
Temiskaming & N. Ontario Ry. Com	Toronto			79,000 00	16,508 98	11,212 95		83	10	1,483 95
Temiskaming Tel. Co	New Liskeard	50,124 00	20,000 00	110,238 56	39,733 22	22,678 71		1,240	34	16,700 57
Thamesville Tel. Co., Ltd	Thamesville	9,000 00		25,758 79	5,456 46	2,902 94		445	7	2,002 00
Thedford, Arkona & E. Lambton Tel. Co., Ltd	Thedford	9,690 00	2,800 00	13,472 37	3,591 35	2,286 25		243	4	1,163 29
Thompson Private Line	Elm Tree			300 00				3		
Tilbery West Municipal Tel. System	Comber		27,750 00	29,190 40	6,109 48	2,853 23		533	3	1,836 00
Todd & Darling Tel. Line	Goodwood			1,000 00	25 00	25,00		16		
Townline, Brant & Elderslie Tel. Co	Chesley			434 00	79 00	77 00		14		
Townline & Seventh Line Tel. Co	Beachburg			450 00	59 00	59 00		9		31 00
Tuckersmith Municipal Tel. System	Seaforth		40,913 00	40,913 00	9,225 55	5,150 69		677	1	1,020 00
Turners Private Line	Millbrook			6,000 00	600 00	225 00		150	2	225 00
Tye & Barr Tel. System	Milverton			10,130 00	1,978 00	1,966 00		184	3	924 75
Ungers Tel. Line	St. Williams	90 00		110 00				11		
Union Rural Tel. Asso	Cobden	900 00		900 00	195 00	190 00		22	2	25 00
Union Tel. Club	Owen Sound			760 00	113 50	113 50		18		
Union Tel. Co., Ltd	Drayton	6,720 00		15,900 00	4,246 39	3,453 96		286	2	900 00
United Tel. Co., Ltd	Denfield	35,000 00		36,942 90	5,027 06	3,448 58		500	6	3,130 70
Urban & Rural Tel. Co., Ltd	Bothwell	16,000 00		20,811 41	7,092 56	3,415 55		360	8	2,134 67
Valentia Central Line	Valentia	1,100 00		1,675 00	328 68	138 56		55	1	18 00
Violet Hill Rural Tel. Asso	Camilla			660 00	102 00	105 00		14	2	16 00
Verner Tel. Co	Verner	300 00		300 00	140 00	30 00		18	1	30 00
Vernonville Tel. Co	Vernonville			1,010 00	406 00	145 00		39	1	
Village Tel. Co	Little Britain			450 00	50 00	50 00		14		
Wallacetown & Lake Shore Tel. Asso., Ltd	Wallacetown	3,320 00		3,300 00	2,317 21	2,271 59		190	5	1,155 80
Walsingham Centre & Port Rowan Tel. Co	Port Rowan			800 00	60 00	60 00		24	2	60 00
Waterloo Municipal Tel. Asso	Preston		20,604 00	19,946 32	2,482 00	2,482 00		312	5	1,400 00
Welland County Tel. Co., Ltd	Bridgeburg	48,325 00	12,800 00	79,490 44	21,382 58	7,903 80		1,034	13	5,585 00
West Garafraxa Tel. Co., Ltd	Bellwood	2,043 80		3,310 81	400 66	374 46		59	3	258 50
Westmeath Tel. Asso	Beachburg	1,500 00		1,410 00	130 00	130 00		30		
Westmeath & Beachburg Tel. Asso	Beachburg			2,250 00	253 50	253 50		47	1	20 00
Westmeath & Seventh Line Tel. Co	Beachburg			800 00	60 00	25 00		15	1	20 00
West Williams Rural Tel. Association	Strathroy	6,409 00	784 00	6,861 00	2,061 25	2,132 10		129	8	675 23
Westport Tel. Co	Westport	3,816 00		8,716 95	1,695 50	350 00	200		5	320 00
Wheatley Tel. Co., Ltd	Wheatley	13,933 50		17,804 72	3,597 36	2,661 75		313	5	1,656 00
Wiarton & Lake Charles Tel. Co	North Keppel	3,000 00		3,000 00	350 00	204 00		51	1	70 00
Wightman Tel. System	Clifford			14,000 00	2,700 00	1,600 00		252	4	1,010 00
Windham Tel. System	Delhi	1,500 00		1,600 00	325 00	175 00		23		
Wilson Private Line	Milton			150 00	40 00	40 00		6		
Woodbridge & Vaughan Tel. Co., Ltd	Maple	10,000 00		25,872 00	9,427 00	4,287 00		530	7	2,389
Woodford Tel. Club	Woodford			2,177 00	200 00	200 00		28	1	15 00
Woodville Glen Tel. Co	Woodville			750 00	100 00	63 00		19		
Wolford Tel. Co., Ltd	Eastons' Corners	3,000 00		3,600 00	655 00	315 00		72	3	235 00

TABLE 1.—Statement of Capital, Cost, Revenue, Operating Expenses, Number of Telephones, Employees, etc.—*Concluded.*

Name of Company.	Address.	Capital Stock.	Funded Debt.	Cost of Property and Equipment.	Revenue.	Operating Expenses.	Number of Telephones.		Employees and Remuneration.	
							Central.	Magneto	No.	Amount.
		$ cts.	$ cts.	$ cts.	$ cts.	$ cts.				$ cts.
Wolftown Tel. Association	Cobden			932 00	91 87	90 00		17	2	25 70
Wroxeter Tel. Co., Ltd	Wroxeter	14,095 00		14,600 00	3,302 50	2,250 53		300	2	981 10
Yarker Rural Tel. Co	Moscow			2,320 00	116 00	116 00		58	1	87 00
Yarmouth Tel. Co. ,Ltd	New Sarum	2,530 00		2,774 81	1,227 51	1,175 78		75	4	200 00
Zion Central Line	Little Britain			180 00	70 25	70 25		18	1	27 00
Zion Line Tel. Association	Cobden			640 00	97 00	91 00		18		
Zorra Tel. Association	Embro	3,620 00	1,800 00	6,823 00	2,212 87	2,078 24		131	2	1,272 06
Total		1,864,375 61	1,834,317 71	5,197,066 52	978,206 05	637,287 96	128,280	111,327	6,620	3,272,428 66

Table 2.—Statement of Miles of Wire Equipment—Urban and Rural.

Name of Company.	Address.	Urban.					Rural.				
		Galvanized	Copper Wire.				Galvanized.	Copper Wire.			
		Single Wire.	Single Wire.	Overhead.	Underground.	Submarine.	Single Wire.	Single Wire.	Overhead.	Underground.	Submarine.
Ontario.		Miles.	Miles.	Miles.	Miles.	Miles.	Miles.	Miles.	Miles.	Miles.	Miles.
"A" Line Telephone Co	Harmony						15·00				
Aberdeen—Plummer Centre Tel. Co	Plummer						42·00				
Admaston Tel. Asso	Admaston Station						24·00				
Addison Tel. Co	Addison						101·00				
Aldboro Farmers Tel. Asso	Rodney						155·00				
Alba Tel. Asso	Pembroke						150·00				
Allenford Tel. Co.	Allenford						75·00				
Algoma Central & Hudson Bay Ry. Co	Sault Ste. Marie						195·60	604·50			
Algoma Eastern Ry. Co	Sault Ste Marie						170·88				2·40
Alice Tel. Co	Pembroke						20·00				
Ahmic Tel. Co., Ltd	Ahmic Harbour						199·00				
Alnwick Tel. Co., Ltd	Roseneath	2·00					38·00				
Amable Tel. System	Hepworth						11·00				
Amaranth Tel. Asso	Grand Valley						50·00				
Ansonia & Thessalon Tel. Co	Thessalon						49·50				
Apsley Tel. Co., Ltd	Apsley						42·00				
Ardtrea Tel. Asso	Orilla						58·00				
Armstrong Tel. Co	Earlton						9·00				
Arran No. 1 Tel. Co	Tara						68·00				
Ashgrove Tel. System	Georgetown						2·50				
Ayr. Tel. Co., Ltd	Ayr						168·00				
*Bell Tel. Co., Ltd	Montreal			115,431·00	252,254·00	550·00	116,936·00				
"B" Tel. Line	Richards Landing						3·00				
Back Line Tel. Co	Melanethon						8·50				
Balaclava Tel. Club	Balaclava						43·00				
Balderson Tel. Asso	Balderson						35·00				
Balsam Hill Tel. Asso	Renfrew						13·00				
Balsam Grove Tel. Co.	Cameron						18·00				
Barrie-Angus Tel. Line	Barrie						64·00				
Barrie Island Mutual Tel. Co	Barrie Island						24·00				

*These figures relate to Ontario only.

TABLE 2.—Statement of Miles of Wire Equipment—Urban and Rural—*Continued.*

Name of Company.	Address.	URBAN.					RURAL.				
		Galvanized	Copper Wire.				Galvanized.	Copper Wire.			
		Single Wire.	Single Wire.	Overhead.	Underground.	Submarine.	Single Wire.	Single. Wire.	Overhead.	Underground.	Submarine.
Ontario—Con.		Miles.	Miles.	Miles.	Miles.	Miles.	Miles.	Miles.	Miles.	Miles.	Miles.
Barton & Binbrook Tel. Co.	Hamilton						262·00				
Beaver Tel. Co.	Woodville						5·00				
Beaver Valley Municipal System	Thornbury			75·00			395·00				
Beaver Mills Tel.-Line	Cannington						2·00				
Beatty Tel. System	Garden Hill						71·00				
Beeton Tel. Co., Ltd.	Beeton						800·00				
Belmont Co-op. Tel. Asso.	Belmont						160·00				
Berwick Private Line	Grand Valley						27·50				
Bethel Rural Tel. Asso.	Dundalk						7·00				
Bethesda Mutual Tel. Co.	Bowmanville						6·00				
Bethesda & Stouffville Tel. Co., Ltd.	Stouffville	100·00		100·00			280·00		50·00		
Bethany Tel. Union	Bethany						115·00				
Billings Mutual Tel. Co.	Kagawong						22·00				
Blanchard Private Line	Cannington						10·00				
Blenheim & South Kent Tel. Co., Ltd.	Blenheim	40·00	42·00		0·12		608·00				
Blind River Tel. Co.	Bayview						7·00				
Blyth Municipal Tel. System	Blyth	7·00		117·00			596·00	10·00			
Bobcaygeon Tel. Co.	Bobcaygeon						40·00				
Bolton Tel. Co., Ltd.	Bolton						700·60		90·00		
Bond Corners Tel. System	Woodstock						2·00				
Bond Tel. Co.	Chesley						13·50				
Bowesville Mutual Tel. Asso.	Bowesville						15·00				
Bowman Tel. System	Elmwood						48·00				
Bracebridge & Muskoka Lakes Tel. Co.	Bracebridge						254·00	46·00			
Bradden Tel. Asso.	Latta						280·00				
Brigham Tel. Line	Hanover						100·00				
Brighton Municipal Tel. Co.	Brighton						300·00				
Bromley Line Tel. Asso.	Bromley Line	5·00					19·00				
Bromley Tel. Asso., No. 1	Douglas						36·00				
Bromley Tel. Asso., No. 2	Douglas						26·00				
Brookdale Tel. Co.	Napanee						16·00				
Brooke Municipal Tel. System	Inwood	7·00	2·00				784·00				
Brougham & Grattan Tel. Co., Ltd.	Hyndford						18·00				

Bruce Municipal Tel. System	Underwood		210·00	310·00			570·00	20·00				
Brussels, Morris & Grey Municipal Tel. System	Brussels	57·00		2·00			430·00					
Burgesville Tel. Co	Woodstock						532·00					
Burnt River Tel. Co	Burnt River						180·00					
Byron Tel. Co., Ltd	Deleware						558·00					
"C" Tel. Line	Sea Gull						6·00					
Cadman & Milling Private Line	Napanee						42·00					
Calabogie & Renfrew Tel. Asso	Ashdad	50·00					60·00					
Cambray Tel. Union	Cambray						12·50					
Camden Independent Tel. Co	Newburgh						120·00					
Caradoc-Ekfrid Tel. Co., Ltd	Melbourne	4·50		0·25			559·00					
Cameron Tel. Union	Cameron						47·00					
Canadian Machine Tel. Co., Ltd	Toronto	38·00		1,427·00	2,000·00		370·00		291·00			
Cannon Tel. Line	Sharbot Lake						30·00					
Carlsruhe Tel. Co	Carlsruhe						9·00					
Carholme & Walsingham Tel. Co	Walsingham						5·50					
Central Dufferin Tel. Asso., Ltd	Shelburne						27·00					
Central Tel. Line	Richards Landing						15·00					
Centre Road Tel. Co	Annan						52·00					
Centre Thorah Tel. Asso	Beaverton						16·00					
Chamberlain Private Line	Wheatley						216·00					
Champlain Point Tel. System	Orillia						1·00					
Chatsworth Rural Tel. Co	Chatsworth						118·00					
Chelmsford Tel. Co	Chelmsford	10·00		0·75			44·00					
Chinquacousy Local Tel. Co	Cheltenham						330·00					
Chippawa Hill Tel. Club	Southampton						26·00					
Cochrane Tel. Co	Cobalt	19·00		168·00								
Coe Hill Rural Tel. Co	Coe Hill	40·00					50·00					
Colborne Municipal Tel. System	Benmiller						243·50					
Colchester North Tel. System	Essex						110·00					
Coldstream Tel. System	Coldstream						133·00					
Conn. Tel. Co., Ltd	Conn						112·00					
Consolidated Tel. Co	Caledon						360·00					
Coulson-Jarratt Tel. System	Jarratt						49·00					
Crews Private Tel. Line	Trenton						7·50					
Crown Hill Mutual Tel. Asso	Barrie	24·00					90·00					
Crediton Rural Tel. System	Crediton						350·00					
Dawn Municipal Tel. System	Dresden						280·00					
Delphi, Thornbury & Clarksburg Tel. Co	Camperdown						3·00					
Derby Tel. Asso	Owen Sound						41·00					
Dereham Tel. Co., Ltd	Brownsville						240·00		1·00			
Desboro Tel. System	Desboro						60·00					
Doane Tel. Co	Newmarket						10·00					
Dover Municipal Tel. System	Bear Line						70·00					
Dresden Tel. Co	Dresden						475·00					
Drummond Centre Tel. Asso	Perth						120·00					
Dunville Consolidated Tel. Co., Ltd	Dunville			369·00			228·00					
Dunsford Tel., Light & Power Co	Dunsford						106·00					
Dunwich & Dutton Tel. Assc., Ltd	Dutton	20·00					165·00					

TABLE 2.—Statement of Miles of Wire Equipment—Urban and Rural—*Continued.*

Name of Company.	Address.	URBAN.					RURAL				
		Galvanized	Copper Wire.				Galvanized.	Copper Wire.			
		Single Wire.	Single Wire.	Overhead.	Underground.	Submarine.	Single Wire.	Single. Wire.	Overhead.	Underground.	Submarine.
Ontario—Con.		Miles.	Miles.	Miles.	Miles.	Miles.	Miles.	Miles.	Miles.	Miles.	Miles.
Durham Union Tel. Co	Orono						300·00	1·00	4·00		
East Darling Tel. Asso	Bowmanville						3·00				
East Grey Tel. Co	Markdale						20·00				
East Luther Tel. Co	Grand Valley	6·00					69·00				
East Middlesex Tel. Co., Ltd	Thorndale	8·00		31·00			122·00				
East Woodville Tel. Asso	Woodville						9·00				
Eden Tel. Co	Woodville						23·00				
Edenvale Tel. Co	Edenvale						6·00				
Edgar Tel. Line	Bowling Green						130·00				
Edville & Dunlonald Tel. Co	Colborne						48·00				
Elderslie-Salem Tel. Asso	Dobbinton						22·00				
Eldon Union Tel. Asso	Beaverton						32·00				
Elmsley South Tel. Co	Lombardy						20·00				
Elgin—Chaffeys Lock Tel. Co	Chaffeys Lock						13·00				
Elizabeth Bay Mutual Tel. Co	Elizabeth Bay						8·00	1·00			
Ellis Rural Tel. Co	Cannington						4·50				
Emo Municipal Tel. Co	Emo	10·00					80·00				
Enterprise Tel. Asso	Steelton						2·50				
Enterprise Tel. Co	Enterprise	1·00					6·00				
Erie Tel. Co., Ltd	Selkirk	75·00		150·00			880·00				
Ernst Private Line	New Hamburg						280·00				
Euphrasia Municipal Tel. System	Markdale						82·00				
Evergreen Tel. Co	Douglas						9·00				
Falkirk Co-op. Tel. Asso	Denfield						110·00				
Fall River Tel. Asso	Maberly						16·00				
Fairview Tel. Co	Anten Mills						4·00				
Fairview Tel. Asso	Woodstock						4·50				
Farmers Union Tel. Co	Richards Landing						12·00				
Fenelon Falls Tel. Asso	Fenelon Falls						14·00				
Fenelon Rural Tel. Asso	Cameron						8·50				
Fenella Rural Tel. Co., Ltd	Fenella						35·00				
Fifth Line Tel. Club	Bognor						26·00				
Fingal Tel. Co., Ltd	Fingal						80·00				

Floss Municipal Tel. Co.	Elmvale							30·00		91·25	
Fordwich Rural Tel. Co.	Fordwich							123·00			
Forest Home Tel. Co.	Orillia							13·00			
Fort Frances Tel. Co.	Fort Frances		151·50	241·00				19·00			
Fort William Tel. Co., Corp. of	Fort William	518·30	10,595.48	9·17	37·50	1·00		90·50			
Fourth Line Tel. Asso.	Perth							4·50			
Fourth Line Tel. Asso.	Cobden							6·00			
Fourteenth of Brant Tel. Co.	Chesley							4·50			
Frasier Tel. Asso.	Woodstock							6·00			
Fretts & Brisco Co-op. Tel. Line	Napanee							20·00			
Fingerboard Tel. Line	Sonya							9·00			
Gamas & Shore Road Bay Tel. Line	Gamas Bay							13·00			
Germanicus Tel. Asso.	Germanicus							17·00			
Gillies Hill Tel. Asso.	Chesley							6·00			
Gillies Private Line	Tobermory							150·00			
Glaister Tel. System	Wellesley							260·00		17·00	
Glandine Central Line	Little Britain							14·00			
Glasgow Tel. System	Cannamore							260·00	25·00	3·00	
Glen Eden Tel. Club	Owen Sound							8·00			
Glen Tel. Asso.	Bethany							6·00			
Glengarry Co-op. Tel. Asso.	Alexandria							188·00			
Gloucester Township Tel. Asso.	Carlsbad Springs							8·00			
Goderich Rural Tel. Co., Ltd.	Dungannon							862·00		20·00	
Goderich Tonwship Municipal Tel. System	Clinton							137·00			
Gordon Tel. Co.	Foxey							12·00			
Gore Mutual Tel. Asso.	Harrow							1·50			
Gosfield North Municipal Tel. Asso.	Cottam							130·00		1·00	
Goulais Bay Tel. Club	Goulais River							55·00			
Green Hill Tel. Co.	Mardkale							5·00			
Greenwood Tel. Club	Steelton							3·00			
Greenwood Tel. System	Sutton West							12·50			
Grunwall Tel. Line	Huntsville							9·50			
Guest Private Line	Douglas							3·00			
Haldimand Rural Tel. Co.	Grafton							106·50			
Halton Tel. Co., Ltd.	Hornby							360·00			
Haley's Station Tel. Asso.	Haley's Station							10·00			
Hamilton Tel. Line	Bethany							24·00			
Hamilton Rural Tel. Co.	Cold Springs							90·00			
Hartley Tel. Co.	Hartley							16·00			
Harvey Municipal Tel. System	Peterboro							30·00			
Harrietsville Tel. Asso., Ltd.	Harrietysille							398·00			
Harwood Rural Tel. Co.	Harwood							10·00			
Hawthorn Hill Rural Tel. Co., Ltd.	Palmerston							208·00			
Hay Township Municipal Tel. System	Zurich		5·00					165·00			
Hazeldean Rural Te . Co., Ltd	Hazeldean							80·00			
Henderson's Private Line	Cannington							17·00			
Herie Tel. Line	St. Clements							10·00			
Highland Tel. Co., Ltd.	Ruskview	1·50						72·50			
Highland Tel. Co.	Milberta							62·00			

TABLE 2.—Statement of Miles of Wire Equipment—Urban and Rural—*Continued.*

Name of Company.	Address.	URBAN.					RURAL.				
		Galvanized	Copper Wire.				Galvanized.	Copper Wire.			
		Single Wire.	Single Wire.	Overhead.	Underground.	Submarine.	Single Wire.	Single. Wire.	Overhead.	Underground.	Submarine.
Ontario—Con.		Miles.	Miles.	Miles.	Miles.	Miles.	Miles.	Miles.	Miles.	Miles.	Miles.
Hinton & Jocelyn Tel. Co	Carterton						20·00				
Hoath Head & Grey Tel. Co	Owen Sound						20·00				
Hollow Glen Tel. Co.	Breckenridge						12·00				
Hopetown Tel. Asso	Hopetown						150·00				
Hoover Tel. Co	Nanticoke						8·50				
Horton & McNabb Tel. Asso., Ltd	Braeside						92·00				
Houghton & Bayham Tel. Co., Ltd	Fairground						123·00				
Houghton Bayham & Tilsonburg Tel. Asso	Kinglake						68·00				
Houghton & South Walsingham Tel. Co.	Clear Creek						30·00				
Huron & Kinloss Municipal Tel. System	Rinley						828·00		35·00		
Hyndman's Private Line	Exeter						20·00				
Huntsville & Portage Tel. Co	Huntsville						52·00				10·00
Ice Lake Tel. Co	Ice Lake						25·00				
Indian River Tel. Co	Pembroke						8·00				
Ingersoll Tel. Co., Ltd	Ingersoll	245·00	2·00	285·00	49·00		2·752·00				
Ingleside Tel. Asso	Woodstock						8·50				
Innerkip Rural Tel. Co	Lefroy						500·00				
Innisfil Tel. Asso	Lefroy						75·00				
Islay Tel. Co	Woodville						23·00				
Ivy-Thornton Tel. Co., Ltd	Ivy						55·50				
Jackson Tel. Co., Ltd	Owen Sound						82·00				
Johnston (Dr.) Private Line	Jannetsville						30·00				
Johnson Municipal Tel. System	Port Lock						30·00				
Kaladar & Northern Tel. Co	Northbrook						30·00				
Kenora (Town of) Tel. System	Kenora	648·00									
Kerr Line Tel. Asso	Forresters Falls						6·00				
King Tel. Co., Ltd	King	13·00					187·00		25·00		
Kingston Road Rural Tel. Asso	Grafton	2·00					9·00				
Kitley Rural Tel. Co., Ltd	New Bliss						247·50				
Korah Central Tel. Asso	Sault Ste. Marie West						12·00				
Koshee-Sparrow Lake Private Line	Sparrow Lake						9·00				
Lake of Bays & Haliburton Tel. Co	Baysville						95·00				

Lake Shore Tel. Asso.	Kincardine							36·00	2·00					
Laird Municipal Tel. Asso.	Bar Riger							90·00						
Lambton Tel. Co., Ltd	Sombra	11·00						151·00						
Lambeth Tel. Co., Ltd	Lambeth							19·00		2·00				
Lanark & Carleton Counties Tel. Co. Ltd	Almonte							400·00						
Lanark & Ramsay Tel. Asso	Carleton Place							20·00						
Lansdowne Rural Tel. Co., Ltd	Lansdowne			6·00				325·00						
Lavant-Dalhousie Tel. Asso	Poland							110·00						
LaVallee Municipal Tel. Asso	Devlin			10·00				180·00						
Lee Valley Tel. Co	Lee Valley							24·00						
Leeds & Frontenane Rural Tel. Co., Ltd	Seeley's Bay							430·00						
Leeds & Grenville Indep. Tel. Co., Ltd	North Augusta	10·00	25·00					542·00						
Leith & Annan Tel. Club	Leith							50·00						
Lennox Tel. Co., Ltd	Napanee							125·00						
Lighting Tel. Asso	Gratton							6·00						
Little Britain Tel. Union	Little Britain													
Long Lake Rural Tel. Co	Long Lake							157·00						
Lucknow & Kinloss Tel. Asso	Ripley							11·00						
Lyons Private Line	Markdale							24·00						
Lyndhurst Rural Tel. Co	Lyndhurst			5·50				143·00						
Lyndock, Carholme & Walsingham Centre Tel. Co.	Lyndock							6·00						
Madawaska Tel. Asso	Burnstown							27·00						
Maidstone Municipal Tel. System	Maidstone							175·00						
Malahide & Bayham Tel. Asso	Straffordville	15·00						160·00						
Mallorytown Indep. Tel. Co	Mallorytown							300·00		2·75	1·25			
Manitoulin & N. Shore Telegraph & Telephone Co	Little Current	1·00						162·00				3·50		
Manitoulin Rural Tel. Co.	Mindemoya							122·00						
Manilla Northern Tel. Co	Woodville							40·00						
Manse Grove Tel. Co	Lorneville							20·00						
Maple Grove Tel. Co	Shallow Lake							12·50						
Maple Leaf Tel. Co	Oakwood							10·00						
Maple Shade Tel. Co	Woodstock							2·25						
Mariposa Tel. Union	Oakwood							120·00						
Martintown Tel. Co.	Martintown							77·00		1·00				
Marysburgh Tel Co	Milford							140·00	10·00					
Marmion Tel. Co	Marmion							10·00						
Massey Station Tel .Co., Ltd	Spanish Mills							16·00				0·50		
Matchedash Tel. System	Coldwatez							50·00						
Meath Tel. Association	Cobden							42·00						
Medonte Municipal Tel. System	Moonstone	2·00						492·00						
Melancthon Tel. Association	Corbetton							56·00						
Meek Private Line	Port Rowan							10·00						
Metcalfe Rural Tel. Co., Ltd	Metcalfe							210·00						
Mills Tel. Co	Thamesford							60·25						
Minesing Tel. Association	Minesing							28·50						
Minto Rural Tel. Co., Ltd	Harriston							160·00						
Mississippi Tel. Co., Ltd	Lanark							98·00						
Molesworth Independent Tel. Co., Ltd	Wroxeter							39·00						

TABLE 2.—Statement of Miles of Wire Equipment—Urban and Rural—*Continued.*

Name of Company.	Address.	Urban.					Rural				
		Galvanized	Copper Wire.				Galvanized.	Copper Wire.			
		Single Wire.	Single Wire.	Overhead.	Underground.	Submarine.	Single Wire.	Single. Wire.	Overhead.	Underground.	Submarine.
Ontario—Con.		Miles.	Miles.	Miles.	Miles.	Miles.	Miles.	Miles.	Miles.	Miles.	Miles.
Monk Tel. Co., Ltd	Carp						900·00		17·00		
Monteith-Dempsey Rural Tel. Co	Stratford						74·00	1·50			
Mono Mills Tel. Co	Mono Mills						100·00				
Moorsburg-Desboro Tel. Association	Desboro						12·00				
Moore Municipal Tel. System	Brigden	10·00		8·50		0·75	660·00				
Moore & Moore Private Line	Brooklin						22·00				
Mornington & Wellesley Tel. Asso., Ltd.	Millbank						164·00				
Mount Albert Tel. Co., Ltd	Mount Albert						425·00				
Mount Forest, Wellington & Grey Tel. Co., Ltd	Mount Forest						150·00				
Mount Pleasant Tel. Co	Castleton	10·00	19·00				156·00				
Moscow Mutual Tel. Association	Moscow						25·00				
Murray-Brighton Tel. Co	Wooler						300·00				
Muskoka Independent Tel. System	Martin Siding						50·00	30·00			
Muskoka, Victoria & Haliburton Tel. Co.	Uffington						23·00				
Muskoka River Tel. System	Alport						4·00				
Muskrat Tel. Association	Cobden						16·00				
Mutual Tel. Association	Orillia						1·50				
McDonald Rural Tel. Co	Sylvan Valley						60·00				
McDonald Tel. Co	Trenton						39·00				
McEachern Tel. Co	Linwood						48·00				
McGillicuddy & Zavitz Tel. Co	Watford						7·00				
McHardy Private Line	Merlin						13·50				
McKenzie Tel. Co	Chatsworth						11·00				
McKillop, Logan & Herbert Tel. Co., Ltd.	Staffa	5·00					260·00				
McKillop Tel. System	Seaforth						225·00				
McNab Tel. Association	Arnprior						26·00				
Nelson Tel. Co., Ltd	Milton						285·00				
New California Rural Tel. Co	Kingsville						30·00				
New Dundee Tel. Co., Ltd	New Dundee						246·00				
New Glasgow Tel. Co., Ltd	Rodney						250·00				
Niagara District Tel. Co., Ltd	Jordan Station	3·00		0·50			323·00				
Ninth Line of Cavan Tel. Co	Bethany						8·00				

Nissouri Tel. Co., Ltd	Thamesford							148·00				
Noble Tel. Line	Sutton West							6·00				
Noisy River Tel. Co., Ltd	Glencairn							630·00				
Norfolk County Tel. Co., Ltd	Waterford	50·00		169·00				1,426·00	223·00			
Norfolk & Tilsonburg Tel. Asso., Ltd	Tillsonburg							131·00				
Norland Independent Tel. Co	Coboconk							64·00				
North Bonnechere Tel. Association	Renfrew							8·00				
North Brant Tel. Association	Elmwood							16·00				
Northcot Farmers Tel. Co	Northcot							16·00				
North East Clark Tel. Line	Oak							17·00				
North Easthope Municipal Tel. System	Shakespeare			50·00				546·00				
North Elderslie Tel. Association	Dobbinton							44·00				
Northern Mutual Tel. Co	Marmora							10·00				
Northern Tel. Co	Korah							14·00				
North Horton Tel. Co	Renfrew							16·12				
North Huron Tel. Co., Ltd	Wingham							627·00	1·00			
North Renfrew Tel Co	Beachburg	21·00	1·00	0·50				13·00				
North Wellington Tel. Co., Ltd	Arthur							86·00				
Oak Flats & Vernon Tel. Co	Godfrey							8·00				
Oldfields Tel. Line	Dundalk							3·00				
Oliver Municipal Tel. Association	Murillo							158·90	0·50			
Omemee Tel. Co	Omemee							49·00				
Oro Tel. Co., Ltd	Oro Station							99·00				
Orr Steinhoff Tel. Association	Chesley							13·00				
Osceola Tel. Association	Osceola							40·00				
Osprey Municipal Tel. System	Maxwell							117·00				
Otonabee Municipal Tel. System	Keene								20·00			
Ottawa Hunt Club Tel. Association	Billings Bridge							16·00				
Ottawa Valley Rural Tel. Co	Kars								30·00			
Palace Road Mutual Tel. Association	Napanee							34·00				
Palestine Tel. Co	Woodville							12·00				
Park Head Tel. Co	Park Head							16·00				
Park Hill Rural Tel. Co	Parkhill							87·50				
Pastime Tel. Co	Cobden							28·00				
Paul & Eckert Tel. System	Sebringville							400·00				
Peabody Tel. Co	Chesley							18·00				
Peerless Tel. Association	Woodstock							2·00				
Pefferlaw Private Tel. Co	Pefferlaw							60 00				
Pelee Island Municipal Tel. System	Pelee Island							51·00				
Penhurst Tel. Association	Woodstock							3·00				
Peoples' Mutual Tel. Co., Ltd	Picton			23·00				180·00				
Peoples' Tel. Co. of Forest, Ltd	Forest							427·00				
Peoples' Tel. & Teleg. Co., Ltd	Maynooth	20·00		4·75				365·00				
Perth & Christie's Lake Tel. Association	Perth							60·00				
Perreton Tel. Co	Pembroke							26·00				
Pine Grove Tel. Association	Orillia							4·00				
Pioneer Tel. Co., Ltd	Thornloe							112·00				
Pioneer Tel. Association	Woodstock							6·00				
Plum Hollow & Eloida Tel. Co	Athens			30·00				100·00				
Plummer, Aberdeen & Galbraith Tel. Co.	Ophir							36·00				

TABLE 2.—Statement of Miles of Wire Equipment—Urban and Rural—*Continued*

Name of Company.	Address.	URBAN.					RURAL				
		Galvanized	Copper Wire.				Galvanized.	Copper Wire.			
		Single Wire.	Single Wire.	Overhead.	Underground.	Submarine.	Single Wire.	Single. Wire.	Overhead.	Underground.	Submarine.
Ontario—Con.		Miles.	Miles.	Miles.	Miles.	Miles.	Miles.	Miles.	Miles.	Miles.	Miles.
Pontypool Tel., Lt. & Power Co	Pontypool						10·00				
Port Hope Tel. Co., Ltd	Clarke						335 00				
Porcupine Tel. Lines, Ltd	Cobalt	39·00					87·00	18·00	115·00		
Port Arthur Municipal Tel. Dept	Port Arthur	260·00	50·00	4,200·00	3,200·00						
Port Rowan Rural Tel. Co., Ltd	Port Rowan	6·00					32·00				
Port Stanley Tel. Co	Port Stanley	5·00		0·50			20·00				
Princeton & Drumbo Tel. Co., Ltd	Princeton						340·00	10·00			
Progressive Agriculture Tel. System	Sault Ste. Marie						14·00				
Queen's Line Tel. Association	Queen's Line						9·00				
Quinlan Tel. Association	Stratford						115·00	2·00			
Rainy River International Tel. Co	Rainy River	169·00		1·00							
Rankin Tel. Co	Pembroke						18·00				
Ravenscliffe Tel. Co., Ltd	Ravenscliffe						43·00				
Raymond Tel. Association	Raymond						10·00				
Reid Private Line	Westmeath						10·25				
Richardson's Private Line	Nipissing						10·00				
Richards Landing Tel. Club	Richards Landing						8·00				
Rideau View Tel. Association	Billings Bridge						2·00				
Riverside Tel. Co	Woodstock	3·00					6·25				
Riverdale Tel. Association	Napanee						4·00				
Rochester Municipal Tel. Association	South Woodslee						190·00				
Roch Fendue Tel. Co	Beachburg						8·00				
Robison Tel. Co	Silverwater						14·00				
Rockwood & Onstic Tel. Co	Rockwood						39·00				
Romney Tel. System	Wheatley						24·00				
Rose Tel. Co., Ltd	Rydal Bank						16·00				
Rox Tel. Co	Cobden						9·00				
Rosedale Tel. Co	Sydenham						4·50				
Rosedale Rural Tel. Co	Fenelon Falls						15·00				
Roxborough Indepnedent Tel. Co	Sandringham			10·00			70·00				
Russell Tel. System	Bailieboro						50·00				
Russell Tel. Co	Navan						88·00		2·00		
Renfrew & Shamrock Tel. Co	Shamrock						16·00				

| | | |

TABLE 2.—Statement of Miles of Wire Equipment—Urban and Rural—*Concluded.*

Name of Company.	Address.	Urban.					Rural.				
		Galvanized	Copper Wire.				Galvanized.	Copper Wire.			
		Single Wire.	Single Wire.	Overhead.	Underground.	Submarine.	Single Wire.	Single. Wire.	Overhead.	Underground.	Submarine.
Ontario—Con.		Miles.	Miles.	Miles.	Miles.	Miles.	Miles.	Miles.	Miles.	Miles.	Miles.
Sunny Valley Tel. Co.	Chatsworth						2·50				
Sutton & N. Gwillimbury Tel. Co., Ltd.	Newmarket	1·00					14·00				
Tara-Keady Tel. Co.	Tara						12·00				
Tarbutt Municipal Tel. System	MacLennan						23·00	4·00			
Tarentorus Tel. Co., Ltd	Sault Ste. Marie						14·00				
Tay Municipal Tel. System	Victoria Harbour	3·00					140·00	12·00	5·50		
Temiskaming & N. Ontario Ry. Com	Toronto	68·00					124·00	231·00	658·00		
Temiskaming Tel. Co.	New Liskeard	200·00		7·00			220·00				
Thamesville Tel. Co., Ltd.	Thamesville	50·00		10·00			428·00				
Thedford, Arkona & E. Lambton Tel. Co., Ltd	Thedford	10·00					108·00				
Thompson Private Line	Elm Tree						6·00				
Tilbury West Municipal Tel. System	Comber						429·25				
Todd & Darling Tel. Line	Goodwood						27·50				
Townline, Brant and Elderslie Tel. Co	Chesley						12·00				
Townline and Seventh Line Tel. Co.	Beachburg						6·00				
Tuckersmith Municipal Tel. System	Seaforth						1,100·00				
Turner's Private Line	Millbrook						115·00				0·50
Tye & Barr Tel. System	Milverton						111·00				
Unger's Tel. Line	St. Williams						7·00				
Union Rural Tel. Association	Cobden						12·00				
Union Tel. Club	Owen Sound						12·00				
Union Tel. Co., Ltd.	Drayton						103·00				
United Tel. Co., Ltd.	Denfield						280·00				
Urban and Rural Tel. Co., Ltd	Bothwell	8·00					511·00				
Valentia Central Line	Valentia						28·00				
Violet Hill Rural Tel. Association	Camilla						20·00				
Verner Tel. Co.	Verner						2·00				
Vernonville Tel. Co.	Vernonville						40·00				
Village Tel. Co.	Little Britain						1·00				
Wallacetown & Lake Shore Tel. Association, Ltd.	Wallacetown						40·00				
Walsingham Centre & Port Rowan Tel. Co.	Port Rowan						13·50				

Waterloo Township Municipal Tel. Asso.	Preston						250·00		6·50		
Welland County Tel. Co., Ltd	Bridgeburg	424·00			68·00		894·00		503·00		
West Garafraxa Tel. Co., Ltd	Belwood						68·50				
Westmeath Tel. Association	Beachburg						12·00				
Westmeath and Beachburg Tel. Asso.	Beachburg						36·00				
Westmeath & Seventh Line Tel. Co	Beachburg						7·00				
West Williams Rural Tel. Association	Strathroy						148·00				
Westport Tel. Co	Westport	12·00					88·00				
Wheatley Tel. Co., Ltd	Wheatley	5·00					300·00				
Wiarton & Lake Charles Tel. Co	North Keppel						32·00				
Wightman Tel. System	Clifford						130·00				
Windham Tel. System	Delhi						32·00				
Wilson Private Line	Milton						2·00				
Woodbridge & Vaughan Tel. Co., Ltd	Maple						520·25				
Woodford Tel. Club	Woodford						36·00				
Woodville Glen Tel. Co	Woodville						12·00				
Wolford Tel. Co., Ltd	Easton's Corners						58·00				
Wolftown Tel. Association	Cobden						11·00				
Wroxeter Tel. Co., Ltd	Wroxeter	5·00		11·00			232·00				
Yarker Rural Tel. Co	Moscow						25·00				
Yarmouth Tel. Co., Ltd	New Sarum						40·00				
Zion Central Line	Little Britain						11·00				
Zion Line Tel. Association	Cobden						20·00				
Zarra Tel. Association	Embro						57·00				
Total		3,341·00	11,102·98	123,030·92	257,608·62	551·75	174,588·95	1,314·00	1,945·83	1·25	16·90

TABLE 3.—Statement of Capital, Cost, Revenue, Operating Expenses, Number of Telephones, Wire Equipment, etc.

Name of Company.	Address.	Capital Stock.	Funded Debt.	Cost Property and Equipment	Revenue.	Operating Expenses.	Number of Telephones.		Employees and Remuneration	
							Central.	Magneto	No.	Amount
Quebec.		$ cts.	$ cts.	$ cts.	$ cts.	$ cts				$ cts
Arundel Development Co., Ltd	Arundel	8,800 00		8,800 00	1,827 80	1,570 14		87	2	586 00
Asbestos Tel. Co	Asbestos	1,005 00		2,727 27	1,011 40	665 76		28	1	175 00
Beauce Tel. Co	Beauceville	50,000 00		58,432 00	15,562 19	14,223 22		575	23	5,841 11
Bell Tel. Co., Ltd	Montreal	18,000,000 00	11,149,000 00	36,311,022 00	9,487,008 00	7,248,663 00	*62,573	*10,214	†2,945	1,790,112 32
Belleview Tel. Syndicate	Sherbrooke			511 92	191 12	189 72		9		
Belvidere Tel. Co	Sherbrooke	250 00		250 00	30 00	15 00		5		
Blanchard Tel. Co	St. Marie			175 00				16		
Bonaventure and Gaspe Tel. Co	New Carlisle	60,200 00	15,000 00	85,764 00	8,843 00	7,079 00		380	18	4,079 00
Brompton Paper and Pulp Co. Private Line	East Angus			5,840 00	436 50	225 52		19	2	144 00
Brunette Private Line	St. Charles River	1,000 00		1,300 00	120 00	135 00		20	1	135 00
Boisvert Private Line	Douville	250 00		250 00	100 00	35 00		3	1	25 00
Canadian Tel. Co	Sawyerville	10,000 00		32,884 55	14,195 58	13,085 05		876	20	7,072 88
Centreville Tel. Co	Lachute Mills			350 00	104 75	54 75		7		
Charlevoix and Saguenay Tel. Co., Ltd	Murray Bay	65,660 00		112,339 04	13,847 01	8,709 53		500	25	8,709 53
Chenier Tel. Co	Tingwick	6,000 00		6,025 00	475 00	475 00		102	2	475 00
Chateau Richer Tel. Syndicate	Chateau Richer			250 00	96 00	75 00		13		
Clarenceville North Tel. Co	Clarenceville	450 00		600 00	45 00	32 50		15	1	25 00
Clarenceville and Wolf Ridge Tel. Co	Clarenceville			400 00	16 50	16 50		11		
Citizens Tel. Co	Dunham			14,500 00	7,500 00	5,475 00		400	10	2,750 00
Clarenceville and Nuts Corners Tel. Co	Clarenceville			1,450 00	110 75	110 75		29	1	64 00
Clarenceville and St. Thomas Local Tel. Co	Clarenceville			1,000 00	76 38	76 38		29	1	23 00
Chatham Tel. Co., Ltd	Brownsburg	750 00		645 00	40 40	40 40		16		
Cherry River Tel. Co	Magog	398 92		398 92	12 80			18		
Compton Mutual Tel. Co	Compton			600 00	40 00	40 00		10		
Courcelles Tel. Co	Courcelles	400 00	1,175 00	1,710 67	95 35	95 35		40	1	67 67
Crystal Lake Tel. Co	Magog	709 00		709 00	47 00	47 00		15	2	25 00
Daigle Tel. Co	Manseau	800 00		800 00	45 00	35 00		4	1	35 00
Danis Private Line	Barrette	9,860 50	240 35	10,125 60	3,110 70	480 35	50	30	5	1,300 00
Daveluyville Tel. Co	Daveluyville	1,189 91	1,700 00	2,900 00	540 90	354 42		25	6	233 97
D'Israeli Local Tel. Co	D'Israeli	1,800 00	2,000 00	1,500 00	450 00	100 00		49	2	150 00
Dixville Tel. Co	Dixville			190 52	59 20	59 20		8		

Drummondville Tel. Co., Ltd.	Drummondville	7,400 00	7,400 00	11,384 00	4,065 05	3,515 15		170	5	1,500 00
Eastern Townships Tel. Co.	Sherbrooke	93,725 00	108,700 00	236,946 46	39,214 33	34,406 09		1,505	45	19,503 73
East Wakefield Tel. Co.	Wakefield	2,500 00		320 20	590 76	398 14		43	3	198 50
Eustis Mining Co.	Eustis			800 00	130 00	130 00		20		
Farmers Tel. Co.	Howick Station	23,704 25	21,000 00	48,254 25	4,898 00	4,340 00		445	16	3,550 00
Farrellton Tel. Co.	Farrellton	8,090 00		11,210 00	1,149 20	605 50		129	4	465 00
Fleming Tel. Line	Kirks Ferry			122 63				1		
Fortierville Tel. Co.	Fortierville			1,500 00	100 00	75 00		15	1	75 00
Foster and Bondville Private Line	Foster			500 00	72 00	72 00		12	1	6 00
Fitch Bay Tel. Line	Fitch Bay			1,200 00	311 00	177 00		27	1	100 00
Garvin Private Line	St. Gregoire			2,000 00	525 00	225 00		42	3	75 00
Garthby Local Tel. Co.	Garthby Station			2,400 00	540 00	540 00		54	1	54 00
Geneva Tel. Asso	Geneva	1,200 00		1,300 00	35 00	35 00		32	1	16 00
Girouard Private Line	St. Barnabe South			1,300 00	500 00	300 00		21		
Graham Private Line	St. Jovite			400 00	140 00	120 00		9	1	40 00
Henryville Tel. Co.	Henryville	2,830 00	1,200 00	3,030 00	1,420 00	731 00		108	5	525 00
Hill Head Tel. Co.	Lachute			431 00	45 00	45 00		6		
Hill Tel. Line	St. Armand West			10,000 00	4,000 00	2,500 00		365	4	1,800 00
Kamouraska Tel. Co.	Fraserville	108,700 00	90,000 00	207,408 18	24,193 02	13,199 12		1,666	70	9,500 00
Katevale Tel. Co.	Katevale	288 92		288 92	14 05			5		
Kingsey Tel. Co.	St. Felix de Kingsey	1,625 00	1,625 00	1,700 00	2,700 00	1,100 00		210	3	900 00
Lambton Tel. Co.	Lambton	885 00	2,650 00	3,500 00	131 38	131 38		70	1	125 00
Lachute Rural Tel. Co.	Lachute	1,600 00		1,600 00	132 25	132 25		23		
Lachute East Mutual Tel. Asso	Lachute	230 24		288 94	49 28	49 28		8		
Lac L'Achigan Tel. Asso.	Montreal	1,500 00		1,500 00				5		
L'Avenir Tel. Co.	L'Avenir	600 00	9,100 00	10,770 32	1,900 00	850 00		180	10	850 00
La Conception Tel. Co.	La Conception	2,600 00		2,600 00	518 05	200 00		20		
Lake Valley Tel. Asso.	Asbestos	251 42		600 00				14	1	5 60
Laurentide Tel. Co.	Pointe Gatineau	2,400 00		3,500 00	365 00	150 00		36	2	100 00
La Tuque Falls Tel. Co.	La Tuque	4,000 00	4,000 00	4,000 00	1,100 00	500 00		70	2	400 00
Lake St. Jean and Chicoutimi Tel. Co	St. Joseph d'Alma	65,000 00		65,000 00	3,200 00	3,200 00		900	24	1,000 00
Lievre River Tel. Co.	Buckingham			30,000 00	4,338 11	2,859 55		156	4	1,860 00
Little Nation Tel. Co.	Cheneville	2,500 00	1,200 00	3,100 00	800 00	350 00		50	21	350 00
L'Epiphanie Tel. Co.	L'Epiphanie	1,000 00		1,500 00	140 00	45 00		21	1	30 00
Lotbiniere and Nicolet Tel. Co	Deschaillons	5,000 00		5,433 74	1,195 51	681 73		58	4	279 30
Legault Private Line	Ile Perrot North	2,000 00		2,000 00	575 00	100 00		26		
Magog and Stanstead Tel. Asso.	Fitch Bay			400 00	40 00	40 00		24	1	35 00
Maniwaki Tel. Co.	Maniwaki	2,200 00		2,200 00	150 00	100 00		12	4	100 00
Maniwaki Electric Tel. Co	Maniwaki	38,500 00	50,000 00	13,653 36	2,140 24	1,267 84		84	3	604 50
Mayo and Blanche Tel. Co., Ltd.	Blanche	1,100 00		1,460 94	184 10	38 96		13	1	38 00
Megantic Peoples Tel. Co.	Rectory Hill	30,500 00	7,500 00	45,000 00	8,050 00	4,725 00		735	5	3,410 00
Melbourne Ridge Tel. Co., Ltd.	Kingsbury	1,000 00		2,950 00	645 00	370 00		45	2	50 00
Milby Tel. Co.	Lenoxville	550 00		550 00				22		
Miltimore Tel. Co.	Sweetsburg	10,000 00		10,000 00	3,000 00	2,500 00		150	3	500 00
Mountain View Tel. Asso.	Sherbrooke			570 00	161 75	150 00		17		8 00
Mount Royal Tel. Co.	St. Lambert	20,000 00		22,500 00	4,577 01	3,767 86		230	6	3,214 16
National Tel. Co.	Levis	426,000 00		610,939 86	44,892 62	42,823 09	325	1,945	90	19,538 58
Nedelac Tel. Co.	North Temiscaming	606 00		1,025 00	351 50	351 50		22	2	110 75
Nicolet Tel. Co.	Nicolet	6,000 00		6,000 00	700 00	400 00		78	2	425 00

† Estimated. ‡ Province of Quebec only.

TABLE 3.—Statement of Capital, Cost, Revenue, Operating Expenses, Number of Telephones, Wire Equipment, etc.—*Con.*

Name of Company.	Address.	Capital Stock.	Funded Debt.	Cost Property and Equipment.	Revenue.	Operating Expenses.	Number of Telephones.		Employees and Remuneration.	
							Central.	Magneto	No.	Amount.
Quebec—Con.		$ cts.	$ cts.	$ cts.	$ cts.	$ cts.				$ cts.
New London Tel. Asso.	Richmond			660 19	156 24	114 65		13	1	10 00
Notre Dame de Ham Tel. Co.	Notre Dame de Ham	4,539 26	3,465 00	5,261 16	710 18	498 25		77	3	77 00
North Ham Tel. Co.	North Ham	8,362 00	8,091 00	8,762 42	1,571 00	300 00		174	4	300 00
Olivers Corner Tel. Line	Magog			500 00	37 33	22 80		9	1	
Oxford Tel. Co.	Sherbrooke			200 00	50 00	50 00		6		
Passumpsie Tel. Co.	Passumpsie			622 76	222 24	200 84		11		
Pike River Farmers Tel. Co.	Stanbridge Station	2,000 00		2,000 00	334 00	22 00		17		
Perinet Tel. System	Woburn	2,000 00		2,000 00	300 00	300 00		12		
Pinnacle Tel. Co.	Danville			1,731 00	345 00	256 86		36	2	86 35
Pontiac Tel. Co., Ltd.	Shawville	11,136 78		16,754 29	925 83	702 89		259	3	650 00
Portneuf Tel. Co.	St. Casimir	41,800 00		53,716 48	16,656 55	10,106 00		553	35	3,359 56
Pratte Tel. Co.	St. Celestin	15,000 00		15,000 00	3,500 00	3,050 00		249	33	3,050 00
Quebec-Orleans Tel. Co.	St. Famille			4,500 00	568 00	555 00		80	4	515 00
Richmond Tel. Co.	Richmond									
Rupert and North Wakefield Tel. Co.	North Wakefield	2,500 00		2,500 00	750 00	400 00		77	4	200 00
Saguenay and Quebec Tel. Co.	Chicoutimi	40,600 00	150,000 00	185,302 81	21,379 34	13,801 50		931	33	5,027 58
Scobie Private Line	Bristol			100 00	25 00	13 00		1		
Seale Tel. Line	Morin Heights			700 00	62 40	62 40		5	2	62 40
South Durham, Bethel and Davidson Hill Tel. Co.	South Durham	600 00		600 00	10 00	10 00		7		
Soulanges Tel. Co.	Pont Chateau	3,855 00	750 00	4,396 33	641 71	681 93		43	3	681 93
Stanfold Tel. Co.	Princeville	10,000 00	4,000 00	8,000 00	1,800 00	1,000 00		200	4	900 00
Stoke Tel. Asso.	Stoke Centre			600 00	120 00	15 00		12	2	
St. Armand and Stanbridge Tel. Co.	Bedford			600 00	50 00	50 00		25		
St. Camille and Wolf Tel. Co.	St. Camille	3,500 00	4,000 00	4,000 00	530 00	524 89		125	2	
Ste. Catherine and St. Joachim Tel. Co	Ste. Catherine			5,000 00	1,200 00	600 00		150	3	400 00
St. Claude Mutual Tel. Co.	St. Claude de Richmond	2,154 00	600 00	3,365 00	482 16	307 46		49	4	48 35
St. Gabriel de Brandon Tel. Co.	St. Gabriel de Brandon			3,000 00	600 00	250 00		30	1	150 00
St. George de Windsor Tel. Co.	St. George de Windsor	9,600 00	1,400 00	6,230 00	650 00	190 00		192	12	260 00
St. Ephrem Tel. Co.	St. Ephrem de Tring	485 00	3,550 00	4,127 15	500 83	500 83		52	6	1,035 47
St. Fortunat Tel. Co.	St. Fortunat	3,319 30		3,680 00	1,008 12	148 77		106	1	
St. Fabien Tel. Co.	Panet	1,000 00		1,000 00	160 00	25 00		8		
St. Henri de Masconche Tel. Co.	St. Henri de Masconche	500 00	250 00	700 00	200 00	100 00		17		72 00
St. Helene de Chester Tel. Co.	St. Helene de Chester	3,700 00	1,900 00	3,700 00	900 00	900 00		90	2	140 00
St. Julien de Wolfestown Tel. Co.	Wolfestown	1,800 00		1,800 00	76 00	58 00		70	2	

Ste. Julie and St. Amable Tel. Co.	Ste. Julie	525 00		25 00	75 00	75 00		20	1	72 00
St. Jucie Tel. Co.	St. Jucie de Doncaster			450 00				5		
St. Marie de Blandford Tel. Co.	St. Marie de Blandford			600 00	140 00	75 00		11	1	40 00
St. Madeline Tel. Syndicate	St. Madeline			375 00	18 20	18 20		14		
St. Magloire Tel. Co.	St. Magloire	900 00	450 00	900 00	475 00	100 00		8	2	100 00
St. Marc Tel. Co.	St. Marc	1,137 84		1,114 31	19 15	7 74		40	1	7 74
St. Maurice de Champlain Tel. Co.	Batiscan	35,000 00		44,417 00	7,790 00	6,036 40		200	17	3,000 00
St. Norbert d'Arthabaska Tel. Co	St. Norbert d'Arthabaska	1,700 00	1,200 00	2,700 00	900 00	125 00		98	1	125 00
St. Ours Tel. Co., Ltd	St. Ours	1,500 00		13,000 00	1,700 00	1,000 00		130	7	700 00
St. Paul de Chester Tel. Co.	St. Paul de Chester	4,000 00	15,000 00	10,000 00	2,000 00	525 00		194	3	350 00
St. Perpetue Tel. Co.	St. Perpetue	800 00		800 00	102 00	102 00		12	1	48 00
St. Philemon Tel. Co	Berthier	1,050 00	1,050 00	7,000 00	1,250 00	450 00		80	10	150 00
St. Romain Tel. Co.	St. Romain de Winslow	780 00	1,920 00	1,720 00	50 00	50 00		48	4	60 00
St. Sebastien d'Iberville Tel. Co.	St. Sabastien	2,520 00		5,530 00	1,490 50	440 00		130	4	505 00
St. Sabine d'Iberville Tel. Co.	St. Sabine d'Iberville	15,981 41		15,981 41	1,897 00	1,897 00		203		
St. Samuel and St. Clothilde de Horton Tel. Co	St. Clothilde de Horton			5,459 00	334 27	24 75		60	4	24 75
St. Remi de Tingwick Tel. Co.	St. Remi de Tingwick	2,500 00		2,500 00	60 00	60 00		50	2	60 00
St. Zepherin Tel. Co.	St. Zepherin	525 00		525 00	332 00	145 00		25		
South Ham Tel. Co.	South Ham	400 00						38		
Tipping Private Line	Clarenceville	6,000 00		6,000 00	1,100 00	200 00		110		
Tourist and River du Loup Falls Tel. Asso.	St. Paulin	10,500 00		10,500 00	3,005 57	1,160 92		175		
Upper Lachute Tel. Co.	Lachute	750 00		750 00	60 00	60 00		12		
Valcourt Tel. Co.	Valcourt	6,000 00	6,000 00	6,000 00	1,200 00	680 00		64	4	500 00
Vale Perkins and Mansonville Tel. Line	Vale Perkins			300 00	50 00	35 00		5		
Villeneuve Private Line	Lavaltrie			300 00	150 00	130 00		10	2	90 00
Wakefield and Masham Tel. Co.	Masham Mills	3,250 00	3,250 00	3,250 00	993 07	903 49		82	4	284 12
Warwick Tel. Co.	Warwick	2,000 00		8,000 00	2,275 00	1,310 00		165	4	725 00
Weedon Tel. Co.	Weedon Station	1,750 00	1,000 00	1,660 00	328 98	328 98		37	2	217 88
Wheeler Private Line	St. Jovite			500 00	25 00	25 00		6		
Windsor Tel. Co.	Windsor	3,600 00		3,600 00	116 00	116 00		70	3	116 00
Wright and Pontiac Tel. Co.	Luskville	6,230 65	600 00	6,889 43	1,394 67	791 41		108	3	560 00
Yamaska Tel. Co.	St. Guillaume d'Upson	4,500 00	3,500 00	7,777 45	2,136 13	1,638 43		75	4	800 00
Total		19,375,960 69	11,704,041 35	38,590,730 66	9,824,437,02	7,495,118 28	62,948	29,544	3,723	1,924,682 23

TABLE 4.—Statement of Miles of Wire Equipment—Urban and Rural.

Name of Company.	Address.	URBAN.					RURAL.				
		Galvanized.	Copper Wire.				Galvanized.	Copper Wire.			
		Single Wire.	Single Wire.	Overhead.	Underground.	Submarine.	Single Wire.	Single Wire.	Overhead.	Underground	Submarine.
Quebec.		Miles.	Miles.	Miles.	Miles.	Miles.	Miles.	Miles.	Miles.	Miles.	Miles.
Arundel Development Co., Ltd	Arundel						135·00				
Asbestos Tel. Co	Asbestos	4·00					5·00				
Beauce Tel. Co	Beauceville	161·00	37·00				140·00				
Bell Tel. Co., Ltd	Montreal			35,937·00	183,877·00	294·00	47,012·00				
Belleview Tel. Syndicate	Sherbrooke						3·50				
Belvidere Tel. Co	Sherbrooke						4·00				
Blanchard Tel. Co	St. Marc						3·00				
Bonaventure & Gaspe Tel. Co	New Carlisle	308·00	45·00			1·50	390·00	390·00			
Brompton Paper & Pulp Co. Private Line	East Angus	5·00					45·00				
Brunette Private Line	St. Charles River						16·00				
Boisvert Private Line	Douville						5·00				
Canadian Tel. Co	Sawyerville	275·00	60·00				990·00				
Centreville Tel. Co	Lachute Mills						4·50				
Charlevoix & Saguenay Tel. Co., Ltd	Murray Bay						838·00	270·00	500·00		5·00
Chenier Tel. Co	Tingwick						111·00	1·00			
Chateau-Richer Tel. Syndicate	Chateau Richer						2·50				
Clarenceville North Tel. Co	Clarenceville						2·00				
Clarenceville & Wolf Ridge Tel. Co	Clarenceville						10·00				
Citizens Tel. Co	Dunham						480·00				
Clarenceville & Nuts Corners Tel. Co	Clarenceville						26·00				
Clarenceville & St. Thomas Local Tel. Co.	Clarenceville						19·00				
Chatham Tel. Co	Brownsburg						11·40				
Cherry River Tel. Co	Magog						12·00				
Compton Mutual Tel. Co	Compton						10·00				
Courcelles Tel. Co	Courcelles						10·00				
Crystal Lake Tel. Co	Magog						7·00				
Daigle Tel. Co	Manseau						8·00				
Danis Private Line	Barrette	19·00	2·00	300·00			92·00				
Daveluyville Tel. Co	Daveluyville	20·00					65·00				
D'Israeli Local Tel. Co	D'Israeli						15·00				
Dixville Tel. Co	Dixville						10·00				
Drummondville Tel. Co., Ltd	Drummondville			25·00			68·00				
Eastern Townships Tel. Co	Sherbrooke	390·00		922·00	71·00		1,101·00	227·00			

East Wakefield Tel. Co.	Wakefield							55·00				
Eustis Mining Co	Eustis							15·00	5·00			
Farmers Tel. Co	Howick Station			245·00				817·00	23·00			
Farrellton Tel. Co	Farrellton							122·00	10·00			
Fleming Tel. Line	Kirks Ferry							2·50				
Fortierville Tel. Co	Fortierville							7·00				
Foster & Bondville Private Line	Foster							10·00				
Fitch Bay Tel. Line	Fitch Bay							35·00				
Garon Private Line	St. Gregoire							38·00				
Garthby Local Tel. Co	Garthby Station							60·00				
Geneva Tel. Assn	Geneva							40·00				
Giroaard Private Line	St. Barnabe South							18·00				
Graham Private Line	St. Jovite	3·50						8·50				
Henryville Tel. Co	Henryville							57·00				
Hill Head Tel. Co	Lachute							3·00				
Hill Tel. Line	St. Armand West							360·00				
Kamouraska Tel. Co	Fraserville	1,500·00	130·00	800·00				2,000·00		800·00		
Katevale Tel. Co	Katevale							9·00				
Kingsey Tel. Co	St. Felix de Kingsey	50·00		1·00				809·00				
Lambton Tel. Co	Lambton			25·00				45·00				
Lachute Rural Tel. Co	Lachute							48·00				
Lachute East Mutual Tel. Assn	Lachute							2·50				
Lac L'Achigan Tel. Assn	Montreal							8·00				
L'Avenir Tel. Co	L'Avenir							136·00				
La Conception Tel. Co	La Conception							21·00				
Lake Valley Tel. Assn	Asbestos							6·00				
Laurentide Tel. Co	Gatineau Point	3·00						24·00				
La Tuque Falls Tel. Co	La Tuque							2·75		6·00		
Lake St. Jean & Chicoutimi Tel. Co	St. Joseph d'Alma	40·00						560·00				
Lievre River Tel. Co	Buckingham	67·00							92·00			
Little Nation Tel. Co	Cheneville	3·00						40·00				
L'Epiphanie Tel. Co	L'Epiphanie							15·00				
Lotbiniere & Nicolet Tel. Co	Deschaillons	37·00						11·00		25·25		
Legault Private Line	Ile Perrot North							8·00				
Magog & Stanstead Tel. Assn	Fitch Bay							15·00				
Maniwaki Tel. Co	Maniwaki		5·00					23·00				
Maniwaki Electric Tel. Co	Maniwaki		14·00					200·00				
Mayo & Blanche Tel. Co., Ltd	Blanche							14·00				
Megantic People's Tel. Co	Rectory Hill							700·00				
Melbourne Ridge Tel. Co., Ltd	Kingsbury							44·00				
Milby Tel. Co	Lennoxville							20·00				
Miltimore Tel. Co	Sweetsburg							150·00	20·00			
Mountain View Tel. Assn	Sherbrooke							18·50				
Mount Royal Tel. Co	St. Laurent	100·00		30·50				32·00				
National Tel. Co	Levis			500·00	75·00			3,471·00	854·00			
Nedelac Tel. Co	North Temiskaming							24·00				
Nicolet Tel. Co	Nicolet							17·00		45·00		
New London Tel. Assn	Richmond							10·00				
Notre Dame de Ham Tel. Co	Notre Dame de Ham							20·00				
North Ham Tel. Co	North Ham							227·00				

TABLE 4.—Statement of Miles of Wire Equipment—Urban and Rural—*Concluded.*

Name of Company.	Address.	URBAN.					RURAL.				
		Galvanized.	Copper Wire.				Galvanized.	Copper Wire.			
		Single Wire.	Single Wire.	Overhead.	Underground.	Submarine.	Single Wire.	Single Wire.	Overhead.	Underground.	Submarine.
Quebec—Concluded.		Miles.	Miles.	Miles.	Miles.	Miles.	Miles.	Miles.	Miles.	Miles.	Miles.
Oliver's Corner Tel. Line	Magog						17·00				
Oxford Tel. Co	Sherbrooke						4·00				
Passumpsic Tel. Co	Passumpsic						9·90				
Pike River Farmers' Tel. Co	Stanbridge Station						17·00				
Perinet Tel. System	Woburn						60·00				
Pinnacle Tel. Co	Danville						43·00			1·00	
Pontiac Tel. Co., Ltd	Shawville	23·00					363·00				
Portneuf Tel. Co	St. Casimir						200·00				
Pratte Tel. Co	St. Celestin						175·00	10·00			
Quebec-Orleans Tel. Co	St. Famille						60·00				
Richmond Tel. Co	Richmond										
Rupert & North Wakefield Tel. Co	North Wakefield						38·00				
Saguenay & Quebec Tel. Co	Chicoutimi	403·00	184·00	128·00			489·00	180·00			
Scobie Private Line	Bristol						2·25				
Seale Tel. Line	Morin Heights						6·00				
South Durham, Bethel & Davidson Hill Tel. Co	South Durham						17·00				
Soulanges Tel. Co	Pont Chateau						42·75	0·25			1·00
Stanfold Tel. Co	Princeville	20·00					110·00				
Stoke Tel. Assn	Stoke Centre						15·00				
St. Armand & Stanbridge Tel. Co	Bedford						18·50				
St. Camille & Wolfe Tel. Co	St. Camille						50·00				
Ste. Catherine & St. Joachim Tel. Co	Ste. Catherine						50·00				
St. Claude Mutual Tel. Co	St. Claude de Richmond						47·50				
St. Gabriel de Brandon Tel. Co	St. Gabriel de Brandon						30·00				
St. George de Windsor Tel. Co	St. George de Windsor						38·00				
St. Ephrem Tel. Co	St. Ephrem de Tring						20·00		5·00		
St. Fortunat Tel. Co	St. Fortunat						77·00				
St. Fabien Tel. Co	Panet						14·00				
St. Henri de Mascoucho Tel. Co	St. Henri de Mascouche	1·00					3·00				
St. Helene de Chester Tel. Co	St. Helene de Chester						24·00				
St. Julien de Wolfestown Tel. Co	Wolfestown	5·00					24·00				
Ste. Julie & St. Amable Tel. Co	Ste. Julie	2·00					12·00				

St. Lucie Tel. Co	St. Lucie de Doncaster						10·00				
Ste. Marie de Blandford Tel. Co	Ste. Marie de Blandford						7·00				
St. Madeline Tel. Syndicate	St. Madeline						9·00				
St. Magloire Tel. Co	St. Magloire						8·00				
St. Marc Tel. Co	St. Marc						26·00				
St. Maurice de Champlain Tel. Co	Batiscan	200·00		47·00			191·00	15·00			
St. Norbert d'Arthabaska Tel. Co	St. Norbert d'Arthabaska						12·00				
St. Ours Tel. Co., Ltd	St. Ours						200·00	10·00	2·00	4·25	1·50
St. Paul de Chester Tel. Co	St. Paul de Chester						250·00				
St. Perpetue Tel. Co	St. Perpetue						14·00				
St. Philemon Tel. Co	Berthier						68·00				
St. Romain Tel. Co	St. Romain de Winslow						14·00				
St. Sabastien d'Iberville Tel. Co	St. Sabastien						59·00				
St. Sabine d'Iberville Tel. Co	St. Sabien d'Iberville						140·00	15·00	50·00		
St. Samuel & St. Clothilde de Horton Tel. Co	St. Clothilde de Horton						32·00				
St. Remi de Tingwick Tel. Co	St. Remi de Tingwick						13·00				
St. Zepherin Tel. Co	St. Zepherin						18·00				
South Ham Tel. Co	South Ham						45·00				
Tipping Private Line	Clarenceville						21·00				
Tourist & River du Loup Falls Tel. Assn.	St. Paulin	255·00		5·00			368·00				
Upper Lachute Tel. Co	Lachute						16·00				
Valcourt Tel. Co	Valcourt						40·00				
Vale Perkins & Mansonville Tel. Line	Vale Perkins						8·00				
Villeneuve Private Line	Lavaltrie						6·00				
Wakefield & Masham Tel. Co	Masham Mills						67·00				
Warwick Tel. Co	Warwick						65·50				
Weedon Tel. Co	Weedon Station						6·00				
Wheeler Private Line	St. Jovite						10·00				
Windsor Tel. Co	Windsor						11·00				
Wright & Pontiac Tel. Co	Luskville						49·00				
Yamaska Tel. Co	St. Guillaume d'Upson	62·00					60·00				
Total		3,965·50	477·00	38,965·00	139,023·00	295·50	65,949·55	2,122·25	1,433·00	5·25	7·50

TABLE 5.—Statement of Capital, Cost, Revenue, Operating Expenses, Number of Telephones, Wire Equipment, etc.

Name of Company.	Address.	Capital Stock.	Funded Debt.	Cost Property and Equipment.	Revenue.	Operating Expenses.	Number of Telephones.	Employees and Remuneration.		Miles of Wire.
							Magneto.	No.	Amount.	
Saskatchewan.		$ cts.	$ cts.	$ cts.	$ cts	$ cts.			$ cts.	
Alameda Tel. Co	Alameda	6,925 00		6,900 00	1,324 00	1,170 00	76	1	400 00	398 00
Allan Tel. Co	Allan	12,000 00		9,000 00	2,431 00	2,268 00	86	1	1,362 00	211 00
Allindale Tel. Co	Sintaluta	1,908 00		1,824 00	196 00	153 00	21	1	31 00	56 00
Aberdeen Tel. Co	Aberdeen	1,475 00		1,480 00	180 00	98 00	10		25 00	38 00
Adelaide Tel. Co	Rouleau	2,300 00		2,312 00	288 00	244 00	24			91 00
Audrey Tel. Co	Carievale	1,525 00		1,500 00	112 00	110 00	15		18 00	34 00
Arm River Tel. Co	Girvin	2,000 00		2,300 00	445 00	370 00	20	2	35 00	47 00
Abbotsford Tel. Co	Wolseley	5,850 00		5,073 00	400 00	405 00	37	1	175 00	142 00
Ambassador Tel. Co	Nokomis	1,700 00		1,730 00		65 00	17		25 00	34 00
Argyle Tel. Co	Craik	1,700 00		2,078 00	231 00	141 00	17		18 00	44 00
Ardath Tel. Co	Ardath	5,075 00		4,625 00	905 00	705 00	47	1	751 00	67 00
Aberdeen S. E. Tel. Co	Aberdeen	1,500 00		1,200 00	48 00	48 00	9			25 00
Arm Tel. Co	Craik	1,300 00		1,163 00	324 00	259 00	11		25 00	24·00
Asquith Tel. Co	Asquith	2,300 00		2,038 00		5 00	22			46·00
Arat Tel. Co	Regina	1,750 00		1,650 00		32 00	11		32 00	23·00
Areadia Tel. Co	Indian Head	2,375 00		2,354 00	356 00	228 00	19	1	55 00	45·00
Avonhurst Tel. Co	Qu'Appelle	4,950 00		5,511 00	511 00	230 00	28			160·00
Adanac Tel. Co	Adanac		5,500 00	5,114 00	265 00	135 00	27	1	125 00	75·00
Ardine Tel. Co	Wawota		2,200 00	2,032 00	125 00	84 00	11			13·00
Assiniboia Tel. Co	Assiniboia		8,250 00	6,500 00	235 00	82 00	36			102·00
Alameda Independent Tel. Co	Alameda	20,000,00		1,350 00	512 00	275 00	33	2	720 00	7·00
Abernethy Municipal Tel. Co	Abernethy		3,000 00	3,500 00	1,420 00	1,284 00	50	3		3·00
Brownhill Tel. Co	Grenfell	2,675 00		2,691 00	509 00	528 00	23			55·00
Beaver Creek Tel. Co	Hanley	1,325 00		1,044 00	205 00	117 00	11		10 00	24·00
Buffalo Hill Tel. Co	Southey	2,275 00		2,650 00	637 00	598 00	11	1	25 00	51·00
Boggy Creek Tel. Co	Lumsden	2,775 00		3,880 00	856 00	805 00	25	1	76 00	60·00
Bee Line Tel. Co	Abernethy	1,325 00		1,118 00	126 00	87 00	8			18·00
Broadway Tel. Co	Belle Plain	1,100 00		1,078 00	30 00	31 00	12			22·00
Belbeck Tel. Co	Moosejaw	4,000 00		3,776 00	61 00	215 00	28	1	94 00	112·00
Balcarres S. Tel. Co	Balcarres	3,500 00		5,000 00	391 00	123 00	35		115 00	84·00
Balcarres N. Tel. Co	Balcarres	875 00		875 00	43 00	41 00	7	3	27 00	14·00
Balcarres W. Tel. Co	Balcarres	1,250 00		1,006 00	24 00	15 00	9		15 00	19·00
Buffalo Lake Tel. Co	Tuxford	3,475 00		3,375 00	713 00	809 00	25	1	66 00	80·00
Broderick Tel. Co	Broderick	6,875 00		7,009 00	2,003 00	1,974 00	56		200 00	227·00
Bellevue Tel. Co	Rouleau	1,775 00		1,315 00	132 00	97 00	11		24 00	31·00

Buffalo Head Tel. Co.	Arcola	3,750 00		3,800 00	687 00	369 00	29		158 00	68·00
Bonnie Blink Tel. Co.	Pense	1,199 00		1,057 00	192 00	188 00	12	1	4 00	24·00
Brownlee, Lake Valley & Eskbank Tel. Co.	Eskbank	2,500 00		2,766 00	414 00	226 00	23		18 00	59 00
Browning Tel. Co.	Kisbey	4,350 00		4,800 00	1,026 00	984 00	23		115 00	97·00
Brownlee-Avonmore Tel. Co.	Brownlee	1,950 00		1,957 00	133 00	124 00	19			43·00
Buffalo Plains Tel. Co.	Windthorst	3,400 00		3,643 00	509 00	110 00	25	1	30 00	72·00
Benson Tel. Co.	Estevan	6,825 00		5,800 00	1,379 00	1,094 00	46	1	138 00	160·00
Bredenbury Tel. Co.	Bredenbury	450 00		480 00	20 00	32 00	4			10·00
Boharm West Tel. Co.	Moosejaw	2,510 00		2,371 00	400 00	320 00	21		75 00	67·00
Bloomfeldt Tel. Co.	Sedley	4,250 00		4,287 00	817 00	504 00	32			80·00
Bode Tel. Co.	Swift Current	2,160 00		2,100 00	110 00	114 00	14		15 00	42·00
Breadalbane Tel. Co.	Caron	3,750 00		3,003 00		286 06	31	1	92 00	65·00
Brooklyn Tel. Co.	Tate	3,125 00		2,935 00	561 00	130 00	17			49·00
Baring Tel. Co.	Baring	1,875 00		1,894 00	147 00	91 00	14			37·00
Brookdale Tel. Co.	Moosejaw	1,125 00		1,077 00	108 00	12 00	9			17·00
Beverley Tel. Co.	Beverley	1,050 00			57 00	18 00	11		5 00	19·00
Balcarres-Hill Head Tel. Co.	Balcarres		3,200 00	3,268 00	85 00	85 00	22			46·00
Beatty Tel. Co.	Melfort		8,500 00	7,430 00	258 00	232 00	47	1	100 00	151·00
Beaver Tel. Co.	Yorkton		15,000 00	15,000 00	565 00	161 00	73			342·00
Bell Tel. Co.	Regina		4,200 00	3,809 00	100 00		20			60·00
Bethune South West Tel. Co.	Bethune		6,000 00	5,826 00	440 00	214 00	30			87·00
Beverley Tel. Co.	Beverley		2,200 00	2,290 00	77 00	85 00	11			25·00
Bienfait Tel. Co.	Bienfait		4,000 00	3,651 00	446 00	335 00	20	1	134 00	49·00
Black Lake Tel. Co.	Bladworth		3,600 00	3,482 00	160 00	103 00	16			48·00
Blackley Tel. Co.	Sutherland		6,000 00	5,377 00	267 00	181 00	23			88·00
Bladworth Tel. Co.	Bladworth		2,000 00	1,848 00	98 00	84 00	10			22·00
Bonnie View Tel. Co.	Loreburn		5,400 00	4,900 00	232 00	272 00	25	1	33 00	86·00
Bounty Tel. Co.	Bounty		11,000 00	11,600 00	395 00	715 00	49	1	333 00	152·00
Bright Tel. Co.	Loreburn		4,200 00	4,533 00	150 00	110 00	24			70·00
Brookside Tel. Co.	Wapella		7,000 00	6,979 00	765 00	624 00	34			169·00
Bulyea Tel. Co.	Bulyea		3,000 00	2,610 00	103 00	85 00	15			38·00
Buck Lake Farmers Tel. Co.	Milestone	1,150 00		933 00	246 00	141 00	21			28·00
Balcarres Municipal Tel. Co.	Balcarres		3,500 00	3,500 00	1,105 00	1,040 00	54	2	445 00	6·00
Coulee Tel. Co.	Pense	1,300 00		1,250 00	234 00	229 00	13			14·00
Coburg Tel. Co.	Moosejaw	750 00		750 00	74 00	74 00	6			16 00
Corinne Tel. Co.	Milestone	3,075 00		3,300 00	639 00	590 00	41			105·00
Creelman Tel. Co.	Creelman	5,850 00		6,200 00	1,975 00	1,875 00	73	1	751 00	187·00
Central Tel. Co.	Tregarva	1,200 00		1,283 00	135 00	110 00	9			32·00
Condie Tel. Co.	Condie	1,425 00		1,400 00	285 00	49 00	18			32·00
Capital Tel. Co.	Regina	950 00		978 00	192 00	192 00	9			16·00
Cory Tel. Co.	Saskatoon	2,900 00		3,359 00	635 00	600 00	25	1	166 00	54·00
Chickney Tel. Co.	Abernethy	975 00		883 00	168 00	160 00	7			15.00
Carmel Tel. Co.	Moosejaw	1,750 00		1,481 00	154 00	154 00	14	2		40·00
Coulee View Tel. Co.	Grand Coulee	1,344 00		1,500 00		123 00	12	1	106 00	24·00
Chester Tel. Co.	Moosejaw	3,350 00		4,217 00	282 00	276 00	31			104·00
Cupar Tel. Co.	Cupar	925 00		866 00	54 00	40 00	9		10 00	14·00
Cheviot Tel. Co.	Cheviot	1,100 00		1,000 00	60 00	81 00	10			25·00
Coldstream Tel. Co.	Grand Coulee	1,500 00		1,500 00	203 00	183 00	11		15 00	28·00
Caron Tel. Co.	Caron	5,625 00		4,987 00	225 00	302 00	45	1	200 00	110·00

TABLE 5.—Statement of Capital, Cost, Revenue, Operating Expenses, Number of Telephones, Wire Equipment, etc.—*Con.*

Name of Company.	Address.	Capital Stock.	Funded Debt.	Cost Property and Equipment.	Revenue.	Operating Expenses.	Number of Telephones.	Employees and Remuneration.		Miles of Wire.
							Magneto.	No.	Amount.	
Saskatchewan—Con.		$ cts.	$ cts.	$ cts.	$ cts.	$ cts.	$ cts.		$ cts.	Miles.
Conquest Tel. Co.	Conquest	2,100 00		1,853 00	398 00	315 00	20	1	312 00	41·00
Clear Springs Tel. Co.	Lobethal	625 00		400 00		46 00	4	1	15 00	11·00
Candiac Tel. Co.	Candiac	4,250 00		4,670 00	182 00	48 00	30	2	240 00	93·00
Colfax Tel. Co.	Colfax	1,064 00		1,064 00	12 00		7			15·00
Carnoustie Tel. Co.	Rocanville		7,000 00	6,581 00	210 00	245 00	39			150·00
Casleton-Pennock Tel. Co.	Saltcoats		4,500 00	4,200 00	410 00	345 00	19			66·00
Cedoux Tel. Co.	Cedoux		5,000 00	4,870 00	135 00	72 00	25			69·00
Chamberlain Tel. Co.	Chamberlain		10,000 00	8,845 00	360 00	250 00	50			149·00
Clear Lake Tel. Co.	Semans		6,200 00	5,775 00	200 00	326 00	38	1	137 00	103·00
Colleston Tel. Co.	Prince Albert		6,200 00	6,270 00	210 00	185 00	39			120·00
Colonsay Tel. Co.	Colonsay		16,000 00	15,629 00	707 00	730 00	70	1	180 00	226·00
Cotham Tel. Co.	Dubuc		5,500 00	5,222 00	165 00	152 00	25			90·00
Crescent Tel. Co.	Rouleau		3,000 00	3,535 00	145 00	92 00	19			57·00
Crescent View Tel. Co.	Hanley		2,100 00	1,800 00	50 00	48 00	10			21.00
Crocus Belle Tel. Co.	Kinley		9,000 00	8,676 00	843 00	659 00	49	1	322 00	136·00
Cullen Tel. Co.	Cullen		6,700 00	5,850 00	356 00	280 00	35	1		81·00
Carievale Independent Tel. Co.	Carievale	2,350 00		2,770 00	1,820 00	2,102 00	44	2	650 00	1·50
Carnduff Municipal Tel. Co.	Carnduff		4,000 00	4,395 00	3,868 00	1,772 00	77	3	1,258 00	30·00
Clyde Independent Tel. Co.	Portal	3,000 00		500 00			20			10·00
Dalesboro Tel. Co.	Dalesboro	1,350 00		1,350 00	8 00	20 00	14	1	20 00	28·00
Drinkwater-Briercrest Tel. Co.	Drinkwater	1,275 00		1,645 00	905 00	886 00	27	1	600 00	28·00
Dalmeny Tel. Co.	Dalmeny	6,025 00		5,720 00		814 00	72	1	614 00	96·00
Dundurn Tel. Co.	Dundurn	4,650 00		5,335 00	2,639 00	2,612 00	44		75 00	110·00
Dairy Line Tel. Co.	Battleford	500 00		500 00			4			10·00
Dee Tel. Co.	Abernethy	375 00		360 00	50 00	45 00	5		25 00	10·00
Duff Tel. Co.	Lemberg	2,050 00		1,900 00	130 00	120 00	14		120 00	53.00
Deveron Tel. Co.	Deveron	3,480 00		3,500 00	2,813 00	2,813 00	23	1	50 00	85·00
Davidson Western Tel. Co.	Davidson	1,200 00		1,200 00	104 00	85 00	11			24·00
Dewdney Tel. Co.	Grand Coulee	1,100 00		1,100 00	165 00	130 00	11			18·00
Dubuc Tel. Co.	Dubuc	2,630 00		2,909 00	1,021 00	1,029 00	24		15 00	65·00
Dewey Tel. Co.	Macoun	2,000 00		1,711 00	154 00	257 00	18			41·00
Davis Tel. Co.	Davis	1,350 00		1,808 00	180 00	84 00	14		40 00	26·00
Dafoe-Copeland Tel. Co.	Dafoe		6,500 00	6,298 00	235 00	286 00	36	2	117 00	104·00
Delisle Tel. Co.	Delisle		7,500 00	7,500 00	420 00		42	1	40 00	104·00
Dalrymple Tel. Co.	Cupar		4,200 00	4,164 00	120 00	119 00	26			78·00

Darwin Tel. Co.	Redvers		7,800 00	5,254 00	757 00	202 00	36	1	87 00	123·00
Downing Tel. Co.	Lajord		1,800 00	1,738 00	35 00	54 00	7			20·00
Drinkwater N. E. Tel. Co.	Drinkwater		1,800 00	1,800 00	120 00	43 00	13			27·00
Dummer Tel. Co.	Dummer		12,000 00	11,180 00	1,186 00	582 00	72	2	170 00	170·00
Durham Tel. Co.	Wolseley		4,500 00	4,556 00	216 00	313 00	21	1	125 00	60·00
Duval & Dunkeld Tel. Co.	Duval		5,000 00	4,940 00	318 00	257 00	28	1	162 00	82·00
Duval & Long Lake Tel. Co.	Duval		9,500 00	9,200 00	857 00	296 00	55	1	250 00	172·00
Doukabour Independent Tel. Co.	Veregin	5,000 00		2,000 00		150 00	3			40·00
Dundurn Independent Tel. Co.	Dundurn	2,500 00		3,500 00	1,513 00	1,128 00	45	1	680 00	15·00
Edzell Tel. Co.	Saskatoon	4,775 00		4,850 00	475 00	389 00	32	1	140 00	97·00
Eastview Tel. Co.	Pasqua	2,400 00		1,552 00	78 00	81 00	13			26·00
Elmore Tel. Co.	Elmore	5,850 00		5,600 00			75	1	356 00	160·00
Ellisboro Tel. Co.	Ellisboro	3,750 00		3,665 00	256 00	230 00	32		50 00	100 00
Elgin Tel. Co.	Moosomin	700 00		700 00	72 00	70 00	9			10·00
Empire Tel. Co.	Carievale	1,120 00		1,064 00	264 00	230 00	14		10 00	29·00
Edgeley Tel. Co.	Qu'Appelle	4,500 00		4,236 00	3,002 00	2,965 00	34			207·00
East Line Tel. Co.	Abernethy	1,350 00		1,150 00	84 00	158 00	9		10 00	17·00
East Halbrite Tel. Co.	Halbrite	2,850 00		3,215 00	126 00	119 00	17			50 00
East Fillmore Tel. Co.	Fillmore	1,775 00		1,781 00	525 00	360 00	13		25 00	30·00
East Weyburn Tel. Co.	Weyburn	522 00		522 00	50 00	44 00	5			10·00
East Carlyle Tel. Co.	Carlyle	1,000 00		990 00	201 00	107 00	8			24·00
Elim Tel. Co.	Rocanville	1,600 00		1,710 00	357 00	301 00	15		25 00	40·00
Eagle Creek Tel. Co.	Asquith		9,000 00	8,837 00	564 00	374 00	41	1	150 00	170·00
East Borden Tel. Co.	Borden		7,500 00	7,347 00	347 00	252 00	37	1	60 00	145·00
East Mount Tel. Co.	Strnssburg		8,000 00	6,575 00	280 00	224 00	45			123 00
Edelmae Tel. Co.	Strassburg		5,700 00	4,825 00	375 00	248 00	32			81·00
Elbow Tel. Co.	Elbow		3,000 00	2,765 00	200 00	191 00	16			35·00
Ellsworth Tel. Co.	Macoun		5,000 00	4,085 00	433 00	348 00	30			84·00
Elstow Tel. Co.	Elstow		11,000 00	10,900 00	960 00	605 00	57			220·00
Erie Tel. Co.	Craik		1,800 00	1,744 00	82 00	94 00	9			22·00
Elstow Independent Tel. Co.	Elstow	700 00		750 00	190 00	190 00	13			2·00
Fairlight Tel. Co.	Fairlight	4,000 00		4,034 00	613 00	344 00	30	2	314 00	82 00
Fleming N. Tel. Co.	Fleming	2,750 00		2,849 00	772 00	619 00	32		98 00	77·00
Fleming S. Tel. Co.	Fleming	3,550 00		4,175 00	654 00	610 00	46		18 00	93·00
Fairmede Tel. Co.	Earlswood	3,500 00		3,551 00	760 00	411 00	24	1	113 00	92·00
Forest Tel. Co.	Lumsden	3,225 00		3,250 00	512 00	448 00	32	1	254 00	95·00
Florence Tel. Co.	Carnduff	2,704 00		2,704 00	449 00	355 00	29	1	100 00	78·00
Fertile Valley Tel. Co.	Conquest	3,525 00		2,764 00	609 00	529 00	31	1	468 00	66·00
Farewell Tel. Co.	Tuxford	1,125 00		1,300 00	150 00	100 00	10			18·00
Foam Lake Tel. Co.	Foam Lake	550 00		750 00			15			30·00
Foster Tel. Co.	Abernethy	2,400 00		2,400 00			21			53·00
Francis Tel. Co.	Francis	3,200 00		3,247 00	689 00	620 00	24		37 00	65·00
Fairview Tel. Co.	Regina	1,025 00		1,093 00	64 00	35 00	6			26·00
Fair Play Tel. Co.	Indian Head	1,625 00		1,611 00	401 00	392 00	15		25 00	40·00
Farmers Tel. Co.	Herbert	5,250 00		6,000 00	290 00	1,055 00	56	2	369 00	116·00
Foxleigh Tel. Co.	Regina	2,600 00		2,553 00	156 00	243 00	13	1	28 00	58·00
Farmington Tel. Co.	Hanley	1,125 00		1,200 00	55 00	56 00	11			28·00
Francis N. Tel. Co.	Francis	3,500 00		3,990 00	387 00	292 00	26	1	51 00	66·00
Ferndale Tel. Co.	Welwyn	1,625 00		2,100 00	282 00	44 00	17	1	34 00	40·00
Fish Creek Tel. Co.	Aberdeen	1,125 00		1,032 00	38 00	112 00	8			24 00

TABLE 5.—Statement of Capital, Cost, Revenue, Operating Expenses, Number of Telephones, Wire Equipment, etc.—*Con.*

Name of Company.	Address.	Capital Stock.	Funded Debt.	Cost Property and Equipment.	Revenue.	Operating Expenses.	Number of Telephones.	Employees and Remuneration.		Miles of Wire.
							Magneto.	No.	Amount.	
Saskatchewan—Con.		$ cts.	$ cts.	$ cts.	$ cts.	$ cts.	$ cts.		$ cts	Miles.
Flotewode Tel. Co	Kennedy	3,175 00		3,258 00	745 00	698 00	18	1	101 00	67·00
Fargo Tel. Co	Craik		2,400 00	2,240 00	140 00	92 00	10			25·00
Fields Tel. Co	Heward		2,800 00	2,802 00	295 00	162 00	15			36·00
Finnie Tel. Co	Lemberg		5,500 00	4,948 00	293 00	247 00	23	1	55 00	94 00
Fishing Lake Tel. Co	Wadeana		2,700 00	2,099 00	172 00	156 00	11			32·00
Flett's Springs Tel. Co	Melfort		25,000 00	24,762 00	949 00	724 00	108			443 00
Forward Tel. Co	Forward		7,500 00	6,860 00	626 00	305 00	35	1	243 00	98·00
Foxbury Tel. Co	Craik		8,000 00	8,000 00	165 00	87 00	33			140.00
Francis E. Tel. Co	Francis		9,000 00	8,146 00	183 00	36 00	42			136·00
Froude Tel. Co	Froude		7,200 00	6,800 00	405 00	258 00	41	1	40 00	124·00
Fort Pelly Independent Tel. Co	Pelly	695 00					9			15·00
Fleming Independent Tel. Co	Fleming	2,000 00		1,864.00	1,188 00	1,072 00	30	1	585 00	30·00
Farmers N. E. Independent Tel. Co	Milestone	950 00		965 00	122 00	122 00	12			22·50
Fairlight Independent Tel. Co	Fairlight	725 00		1,000 00	340 00	140 00	17		136 00	10·00
Gray Milestone Tel. Co	Milestone	2,100 00		2,329 00	210 00	207 00	30		50 00	110·00
Golden Flat Tel. Co	Pitman	3,325 00		3,091 00	208 00	30 00	18	1	25 00	64·00
Glen Ewan Tel. Co	Glen Ewan	9,300 00		10,500 00	3,127 00	2,742 00	86		1,450 00	285·00
Greendale Tel. Co	Boharm	1,350 00		1,067 00	215 00	270 00	9			24·00
Greenfell Tel. Co	Greenfell	2,175 00		2,093 00	588 00	496 00	20		25 00	37·00
Grassmere Tel. Co	Qu'Appelle	1,500 00		1,500 00	85 00	84 00	13			28·00
Graytown Tel. Co	Windthorst	2,625 00		3,066 00	607 00	483 00	22		74 00	59·00
Glenside Tel. Co	Glenside	3,000 00		2,928 00	262 00	246 00	19		25 00	48·00
Grand View Tel. Co	Moosejaw	966 00		910 00	72 00	70 00	6			28·00
Garden Valley Tel. Co	Outlook		4,000 00	3,981 00	125 00		26			56·00
Gilead Tel. Co	Hanley		1,700 00	1,632 00	164 00	133 00	9			22·00
Gledhow Tel. Co	Delisle		9,200 00	9,750 00	450 00	485 00	41	2	130 00	148·00
Glen Adelaide Tel. Co.	Wawota		7,700 00	7,750 00	318 00	311 00	37			135·00
Goodwater Tel. Co	Goodwater		5,000 00	4,455 00	270 00	221 00	26			76·00
Gores Tel. Co	Ogema		2,000 00	1,744 00	67 00	32 00	8			36·00
Govan Tel. Co	Govan		15,000 00	15,155 00	2,116 00	1,328 00	78	1	831 00	274·00
Graham-Chatsworth Tel. Co	Saltcoats		6,500 00	6,181 00	308 00	230 00	29	1	105 00	101·00
Grand Bend Tel. Co	Weyburn		7,000 00	5,638 00	607 00	230 00	27			98·00
Green Farm Tel. Co	Herbert		7,500 00	7,936 00	420 00	350 00	38			155·00
Great Deer Tel. Co	Borden		8,500 00	7,945 00	223 00	281 00	45	1	209 00	123·00
Grimes Tel. Co	Lampman		2,300 00	2,049 00	77 00	80 00	10			19·00

Guernsey Tel. Co	Guernsey		10,500 00	10,215 00	760 00	530 00	55				185·00
Grangers Tel. Co	Delisle	1,700 00		1,426 00	180 00	132 00	12				32·00
Grand Prairie Tel. Co	Eyebrow	1,800 00		1,800 00	242 00	193 00	18			50 00	36·00
Glen Ewan Independent Tel. Co	Glen Ewan	850 00		1,200 00	551 00	74 00	27	2	316 00		9·25
Govan Independent Tel. Co	Govan	600 00		467 00	1,330 00	1,206 00	67		150 00		
Gainsboro Municipal Tel. Co	Gainsboro		3,000 00	3,300 00	832 00	876 00	34		660 00		40 00
Haycreek Tel. Co	Maple Creek	950 00		950 00	12 00		7				33·00
Hanley Tel. Co	Hanley	2,525 00		2,880 00	561 00	497 00	17		273 00		67 00
Huron & Clinton Tel. Co	Tuxford	3,375 00		3,724 00	886 00	835 00	27	2	284 00		85·00
Hill Farm Tel. Co	Lemberg	4,125 00		4,125 00	480 00	251 00	32	2	50 00		95·00
Hepburn Tel. Co	Hepburn	6,820 00		6,447 00	560 00	235 00	72		310 00		156 00
Huronville Farmers Tel. Co	Huronville	3,875 00		3,639 00	670 00	575 00	31	1	200 00		91·00
Hope Tel. Co	Abernethy	750 00					5				12·00
Heward Tel. Co	Heward	3,925 00		3,925 00	1,227 00	310 00	37	2	285 00		80·00
Highview Tel. Co	Dumas	2,750 00		3,760 00	830 00	705 00	27	2	215 00		80·00
Holdonian Tel. Co	Francis	1,125 00		1,100 00			9				18·00
Heit's Lake Tel. Co	Lemberg	2,600 00		2,200 00		317 00	20	1	196 00		54·00
Hursh Tel. Co	Macoun	800 00		783 00	142 00	154 00	8				18·00
Hazelcliffe Tel. Co	Hazelcliffe	950 00		801 00	105 00	36 00	11				27·00
Hayes Tel. Co	Nokomis	800 00		847 00		33 00	18				15·00
Hanson Tel. Co	Lajord		4,000 00	3,706 00	108 00	60 00	19				49·00
Heron Tel. Co	Maryfield		4,200 00	4,283 00	140 00	167 00	18				70·00
High Ridge Tel. Co	Kennedy		2,800 00	2,507 00	182 00	148 00	14				37·00
Hildahl Tel. Co	Estevan		5,500 00	5,279 00	428 00	273 00	22	1			96·00
Hill Crest Tel. Co	Bladworth		2,600 00	2,600 00	130 00	124 00	11				15·00
Hillsdale Tel. Co	Simpson		4,500 00	4,279 90	153 00		23				75·00
Hume Tel. Co	Hume		1,000 00	3,400 00	121 00	96 00	16				39·00
Huron Tel. Co	Tugaska		7,500 00	7,500 00	408 00	350 00	43				93·00
International Tel. Co	North Portal	700 00		685 00	141 00	136 00	8		13 00		22·00
Inglewood Tel. Co	Qu'Appelle	5,000 00		4,891 00	785 00	551 00	39		80 00		108·00
Ideal Tel. Co	Griffin		6,800 00	6,269 00	161 00	113 00	24				116·00
Industrial Tel. Co	Bradwell		2,000 00	1,717 00	96 00	39 00	11				21·00
Innes Tel. Co	Griffin		4,000 00	3,212 00	95 00	37 00	20				62·00
Ivanhoe Tel. Co	Moosomin		3,800 00	3,715 00	145 00	114 00	28				45·00
Juniata Tel Co	Juaniata		5,900 00	5,795 00	337 00	339 00	41	2	227 00		81·00
Kenlis Tel. Co	Kenlis	1,250 00		1,250 00	414 00	308 00	15	2	75 00		42 00
Kenilworth Tel. Co	Pense	1,200 00		1,126 00	198 00	220 00	13				25·00
Kinley Tel. Co	Kinley	1,375 00		1,361 00	456 00	504 00	12	1	49 00		24 00
Kendalton Tel. Co	Wapella	1,250 00		1,180 00	180 00	102 00	10		5 00		27·00
King Edward Tel. Co	Regina	1,475 00		1,870 00	204 00	193 00	12	1	74 00		26·00
Key West Tel. Co	Ogema	4,000 00		4,037 00	456 00	325 00	39				111·00
Kindersley Tel. Co	Kindersley	1,800 00		1,800 00		200 00	15	1	75 00		38·00
Kennedy-High View Tel. Co	Kennedy	1,350 00		1,233 00	162 00	70 00	10		10 00		32·00
Kandahar Tel. Co	Kandahar		6,000 00	6,000 00	165 00	162 00	30				68·00
Kansas Tel. Co	Drake		3,500 00	3,186 00	199 00	195 00	18	1	25 00		46·00
Keelerville Tel. Co	Keeler		8,800 00	8,452 00	1,021 00	774 00	54	2	611 00		145·00
Kenaston Tel. Co	Kenaston		11,000 00	10,717 00	583 00	496 00	52	1	221 00		150·00
Khedive Tel. Co	Khedive		6,000 00	6,000 00	78 00	67 00	43	1			72·00
Kindred Tel. Co	Holdfast		5,000 00	5,032 00	306 00	315 00	27				74·00
Long Grade Tel Co	Milestone	760 00		760 00			12				22·00

Name of Company.	Address.	Capital Stock.	Funded Debt.	Cost Property and Equipment.	Revenue.	Operating Expenses.	Number of Telephones.	Employees and Remuneration.		Miles of Wire.
							Magneto.	No.	Amount.	
Saskatchewan—Con.		$ cts.	$ cts.	$ cts.	$ cts.	$ cts.			$ cts.	Miles.
Lang Mutual No. 1 Tel Co	Lang	630 00		630 00		40 00	16			16·00
Lang Mutual No. 2 Tel, Co	Lang	640 00		474 00		27 00	16		27 00	16·00
Lang Mutual No. 3 Tel. Co	Lang	1,050 00		900 00		67 00	14			13·00
Lang Mutual No. 4 Tel. Co	Lang	1,300 00		1,300 00	122 00	115 00	26			28·00
Lang Mutual No. 5 Tel. Co	Lang	1,500 00		1,700 00		82 00	28			34·00
Lake Centre Tel. Co	Strassburg	6,000 00		5,500 00	400 00	416 00	40	1	150 00	124·00
Laird Tel. Co	Laird	5,700 00		5,302 00	926 00	2,000 00	54	1	580 00	130·00
Lac Qui Parle Tel. Co	Midale	6,800 00		6,800 00	1,553 00	799 00	66			167·09
Lumsden Beach Tel. Co	Lumsden	2,400 00		1,725 00		286 00	23	1	132 00	37·00
Lake Tel. Co	Abernethy	600 00		650 00	75 00	77 00	8			14·00
Livingstone Tel. Co	Brownlee	1,315 00		1,312 00	91 00	83 00	11	1	45 00	25·00
Laura Tel. Co	Laura	7,600 00		6,810 00	1,955 00	1,704 00	78	1	750 00	170·00
Little Bluff Tel. Co	Moosomin	1,525 00		2,300 00	591 00	491 00	15			41·00
Loretta Tel. Co	Dalmeny	700 00		681 00		60 00	7	3	13 00	13·00
Luton Tel. Co	Dubuc	850 00		839 00	135 00	135 00	8			19·00
Lorlie Tel. Co	Lorlie	1,650 00		1,571 00	125 00	107 00	13	1	44 00	36·00
Last Mountain Tel. Co	Semans	3,450 00		3,580 00	506 00	319 00	27		75 00	80·00
Laford Tel. Co	Laford		3,000 00	2,945 00	70 00	56 00	16			40·00
Lampman Tel. Co	Lampman		8,000 00	7,446 00	450 00	279 00	51			117·00
Lampman North Tel. Co	Lampman		3,000 00	2,786 00	90 00	82 00	18	2	75 00	38·00
Landon Tel. Co	Lampman		5,700 00	5,700 00			27			62·00
Langbank Tel. Co	Langbank		6,500 00	6,572 00	333 00	287 00	47			117·00
Lanigan Tel. Co	Lanigan		2,000 00	1,900 00	55 00	100 00	11			22·00
Latham Tel. Co	Osage		6,200 00	4,815 00	361 00	309 00	26			104·00
Little Maniton Tel. Co	Watrous		3,700 00	3,200 00	125 00	180 00	16			51·00
Lynne Tel. Co	Langham		8,300 00	6,845 00	140 00	93 00	28			100·00
Laura Indep. Tel. Co	Laura	1,000 00		1,000 00			14			0·75
Lumsden Indep. Tel. Co	Lumsden	2,400 00		5,184 00	3,485 00	2,810 00	109	5	1,894 00	10·00
Maple Leaf Te. Co	Tuxford	3,000 00		3,200 00	310 00	300 00	24	1	220 00	78 00
Moosomin East Tel. Co	Moosomin	800 00		1,100 00	173 00	162 00	11		39 00	22·00
Moosomin Tel. Co	Moosomin	3,600 00		4,244 00	821 00	746 00	52		65 00	137·00
McTaggart Tel. Co	McTaggart	4,825 00		5,000 00	1,978 00	1,957 00	68	1	1,186 00	126·00
MooseJaw, Granton & Blue Hill Tel. Co	MooseJaw	5,550 00		6,749 00	71 00	249 00	57	4	222 00	184·00
Minnesota Tel. Co	Vanscoy	1,150 00		1,547 00	145 00	79 00	20			60·00

Markinch Tel. Co	Markinch	2,500 00		3,272 00	717 00	120 00	23	1	70 00	62·00
McFarlane Te. Co	Nokomis	1,200 00		1,380 00	77 00	78 00	12		10 00	30·00
Meadowvale Tel. Co	Saltcoats	500 00		470 00	205 00	103 00	8		12 00	18·00
McLean Tel. Co	McLean	1,500 00		1,800 00	250 00	146 00	25		72 00	35·00
Midway Tel. Co	Strassburg	1,750 00		1,287 00	252 00	121 00	14			33·00
Mount Pisgah Tel. Co	Balcarres	600 00		510 00	53 00	71 00	8			18·00
Maple Grove Tel. Co	Cupar	1,050 00		1,086 00	182 00	135 00	10			24·00
Markinch North Tel. Co	Markinch	1,600 00		1,280 00	160 00	80 00	16			30·00
Markinch South Tel. Co	Markinch	1,100 00		1,043 00	325 00	185 00	10		20 00	23·00
Mountain Side Tel. Co	Strassburg	500 00		489 00	75 00	36 00	5			16·00
Montgomery Tel. Co	Kennedy	700 00		498 00	80 00	71 00	5			18·00
Manor Tel. Co	Manor		10,000 00	9,535 00	686 00	464 00	60			150·00
Maple Valley Tel. Co	Davidson		4,200 00	4,327 00	733 00	501 00	22			136·00
Marquis Tel. Co	Marquis		10,000 00	9,375 00	360 00	313 00	60	1	165 00	136·00
Maryfield Tel. Co	Maryfield		7,000 00	6,405 00	192 00	170 00	35	1	31 00	106·00
McGregor Tel. Co	Macoun		4,200 00	6,359 00	394 00	218 00	33			68·00
Morris Tel. Co	Osage		5,500 00	4,604 00	218 00	209 00	30			72·00
Morse Tel. Co	Morse		15,000 00	15,000 00	1,270 00	696 00	70	1	225 00	174·00
Milestone Farmers Tel. Co	Milestone	2,160 00		3,353 00	3,467 00	3,364 00	65	3	2,137 00	12·00
Milestone S.W. Indep. Tel. Co	Milestone	2,025 00		1,991 00	309 00	306 00	27		27 00	35·00
Maryfield Indep. Tel. Co	Maryfield	1,735 00		1,826 00	152 00	152 00	27	3	83 00	10·00
Maple Creek Indep. Tel. Co	Maple Creek	10,460 00			2,700 00	900 00	151	2	1,300 00	54·00
Midale Indep. Tel. Co	Midale	1,800 00		2,316 00	1,537 00	1,246 00	22	2	635 00	5·00
Melfort Municipal Tel. Co	Melfort		9,100 00	12,046 00	5,109 00	3,227 00	140	5	1,539 00	5·00
Moose Mountain Tel. Co	Arcola	4,775 00		4,711 00	760 00	380 00	38		96 00	146·00
MooseJaw Enterprise Tel. Co	Moosejaw	1,175 00		1,069 00	200 00	147 00	10		92 00	18·00
New Imperial Tel. Co	Imperial		26,000 00	26,000 00			151			342·00
North Regina Tel. Co	Regina	525 00		646 00		60 00	7		4 00	9·00
North Carrieval Tel. Co	Carievale	900 00		877 00	11 00	106 00	14			22·00
North Portal Tel. Co	North Portal	2,275 00		2,538 00	509 00	273 00	28		25 00	71·00
North Weyburn Tel. Co	Weyburn	3,400 00		3,420 00	257 00	548 00	31		25 00	81·00
North Pense Tel. Co	Pense	6,500 00		6,200 00	1,188 00	1,132 00	67		25 00	198·00
North Aberdeen Tel. Co	Aberdeen	525 00		517 00	106 00	63 00	5			10·00
N. Halbrite Tel. Co	Halbrite	3,475 00		4,077 00	295 00	289 00	26		60 00	63·00
N. Yorkton Tel. Co	Yorkton	5,000 00		5,686 00	672 00	300 00	45			150·00
N. Antler Tel. Co	Gainsboro	2,520 00		2,530 00	239 00	239 00	22		35 00	58·00
N. Star Tel. Co	Wapella	1,375 00		1,250 00	100 00	90 00	11	1	40 00	35·00
N. Kisbey Tel. Co	Kisbey	3,875 00		3,984 00			31			74·00
N. Craven Tel. Co	Craven	2,700 00		2,573 00	372 00	204 00	21		20 00	50·00
N. Wideawake Tel. Co	Fort Qu'Appelle	1,398 00		1,473 00		69 00	8	1	45 60	39·00
N. Langham Tel. Co	Langham	449 00		436 00		5 00	6			10·00
N. E. Weyburn Tel. Co	Weyburn	1,200 00		1,050 00		65 00	11		10 00	21·00
Nutana Tel. Co	Saskatoon	900 00		675 00		78 00	9			11·00
New Steinbach Tel. Co	Aberdeen	1,500 00		1,040 00	140 00	145 00	8	1		32·00
New Deloraine Tel. Co	Davidson	2,825 00		3,000 00	648 00	655 00	24	1		60·00
New Hastings Tel. Co	Moosomin	2,050 00		2,475 00	347 00	343 00	20		50 00	55·00
Nokomis Tel. Co	Nokomis	2,500 00		2,705 00	304 00	200 00	19			52·00
Newberry Tel. Co	Archive	3,275 00		3,274 00	434 00	377 00	29	1	129 00	53·00
Naisberry Tel. Co	Melfort		6,000 00	5,655 00	315 00	277 00	38			81·00
Neidpath Tel. Co	Herbert		13,000 00	12,400 00	564 00	518 00	69			190·00

TABLE 5.—Statement of Capital, Cost, Revenue, Operating Expenses, Number of Telephones, Wire Equipment, etc. *Con.*

Name of Company.	Address.	Capital Stock.	Funded Debt.	Cost Property and Equipment.	Revenue.	Operating Expenses.	Number of Telephones.	Employees and Remuneration		Miles of Wire.
							Magneto.	No.	Amount.	
Saskatchewan—Con.		$ cts.	$ cts.	$ cts.	$ cts.	$ cts.			$ cts.	Miles.
N. Bienfait Tel. Co.	Bienfait		5,700 00	4,847 00	255 00	210 00	31			82·00
N. Redvers Tel. Co.	Redvers		6,800 00	6,065 00	325 00	175 00	30			82·00
N. Tyvan Tel. Co.	Tyvan		1,500 00	1,290 00	119 00	76 00	6			20·00
Okabena Tel. Co.	Drinkwater	1,000 00		990 00		80 00	18			18·00
Oxbow Tel. Co.	Oxbow	7,575 00		9,646 00	1,866 00	1,237 00	93	1	475 00	327·00
Overbrook Tel. Co.	Eyebrow	2,100 00		2,130 00	186 00	178 00	20		25 00	56·00
Odessa Tel. Co.	Odessa		11,000 00	9,948 00	413 00	331 00	66			148·00
Outram Tel. Co.	Outram		4,800 00	4,838 00	138 00	300 00	27			68·00
Oxbow Independent Tel. Co.	Oxbow	1,975 00		5,210 00	3,017 00	2,770 00	90		1,092 00	
Prairie Home Tel. Co.	Craik	1,800 00		2,150 00	776 00	776 00	18		3 00	46·00
Pioneer Tel. Co.	Moosejaw	1,100 00		1,100 00	70 00	70 00	11			24·00
Pheasant Plains Tel. Co.	Blackwood	1,675 00		1,945 00	151 00	65 00	11		12 00	36·00
Pheasant Creek Tel. Co.	Lemberg	2,500 00		2,355 00	125 00	391 00	20	1	53 00	44·00
Pheasant Forks Tel. Co.	Lemberg	1,800 00		1,400 00	141 00	150 00	12	1	145 00	42·00
Pasqua Tel. Co.	Pasqua	900 00		500 00		90 00	9		42 00	14·00
Pasqua N. E. Tel. Co.	Pasqua	1,320 00		1,320 00			8			22·00
Pengarth Tel. Co.	Pengarth	2,900 00		2,745 00	285 00	227 00	19			128·00
Prairieville Tel. Co.	Swift Current	1,000 00		1,100 00	198 00	183 00	12			24·00
Prospect Tel. Co.	Weyburn	1,950 00		1,114 00	241 00	238 00	10			27·00
Park Tel. Co.	Watrous	675 00		680 00		60 00	9		10 00	12·00
Prairieview Tel. Co.	Eyebrow	2,350 00		2,244 00	120 00	90 00	15			55·00
Prosperity Tel. Co.	Prosperity	2,350 00		2,244 00	120 00	90 00	15			55·00
Poplar Grove Tel. Co.	Wolseley	1,625 00		1,611 00	145 00	213 00	11	1	81 00	36·00
Pangman Tel. Co.	Pangman	7,000 00		7,330 00	1,344 00	1,293 00	57	1	715 00	120·00
Potter Tel. Co.	Tyvan	625 00		500 00	50 00	70 00	5		10 00	11·00
Pelly Tel. Co.	Pelly		1,200 00	1,200 00	25 00		6			10·00
Pheasant Hills Tel. Co.	Melville		10,000 00	9,750 00	228 00	257 00	36			172·00
Pheasant Valley Tel. Co.	Bladworth		8,300 00	7,993 00	328 00	208 00	40			154·00
Prairie Tel. Co.	Tate		3,200 00	2,677 00	193 00	85 00	17			33·00
Prairie Lea Tel. Co.	Creelman		4,700 00	4,687 00	375 00	305 00	27			66·00
Prairie Lily Tel. Co.	Rouleau		4,000 00	3,848 00	225 00	184 00	20			53·00
Progressive Tel. Co.	Bradwell		2,200 00	1,845 00	126 00	62 00	10			21·00
Pense Independent Tel. Co.	Pense	1,575 00	2,885 00				40			
Regina-Grand View Tel. Co.	Kronau	3,850 00		3,880 00	280 00	275 00	21	1	50 00	92·00
Rouleau Farmers Tel. Co.	Rouleau	1,725 00		1,800 00	355 00	343 00	26		69 00	70 00

Riverside Tel. Co.	Rouleau	625 00		625 00		88 00	10			17·60
Rose Plain Tel. Co	Regina	3,500 00		3,500 00	480 00	300 00	24		50 00	60·00
Rose Valley Tel. Co	Indian Head	4,025 00		3,082 00	676 00	381 00	37		55 00	97·00
Rough Bark Tel. Co.	Halbrite	1,875 00		1,981 00	143 00	153 00	25		74 00	78·00
Regina Beach Tel. Co.	Lumsden	2,500 00		2,900 00	352 00	275 00	22	3	20 00	52·00
Riga Tel. Co.	Riga	1,600 00		1,800 00	240 00	135 00	13		45 00	58·00
Red Fox Valley Tel. Co	Sintaluta	3,350 00		3,050 00	140 00	134 00	20	1	40 00	54·00
Rufus Tel. Co.	Pense	1,100 00		962 00	198 00	152 00	11			21·00
Rocanville Tel. Co	Rocanville	5,175 00		6,440 00	1,082 00	773 00	57		3 00	116·00
Rudolph Tel. Co.	Rouleau	1,275 00		1,600 00	383 00	178 00	15			24·00
Ruby Tel. Co.	Aylesbury	1,100 00		1,030 00	29 00	16 00	10			24·00
Rosthern Tel. Co.	Laird	5,050 00		4,625 00	238 00	270 00	32	1	82 00	116·00
Reciprocity Tel. Co.	Pense	830 00		800 00			9			13·00
Richfarms Tel. Co.	Nokomis	5,685 00		5,800 00	393 00	346 00	48			74·00
Rainton Tel. Co.	Rainton		6,000 00	6,264 00	135 00	63 00	31			85·00
Raymore Tel. Co.	Raymore		8,500 00	8,500 00	190 00	96 00	29			104·00
Redrows Tel. Co	Balcarres		1,200 00	1,185 00	30 00	41 00	6			19·00
Regal Tel. Co.	Swift Current		5,800 00	5,700 00	130 00	49 00	23			82·00
Renown Tel. Co.	Renown		5,300 00	5,101 00	155 00	60 00	28			83·00
Rhein Tel. Co.	Rhein		4,000 00	4,000 00	110 00	70 00	16			36·00
Riceton Tel. Co.	Riceton		13,000 00	11,370 00	772 00	506 00	62			163·00
Rich Priarie Tel. Co.	Bienfait		6,200 00	6,200 00	165 00	128 00	23		25 00	86·00
Rowletta Tel. Co.	Caron		4,100 00	4,100 00	120 00	120 00	15			71·00
Roxboro Tel. Co.	Griffin		3,600 00	3,543 00	135 00	34 00	18			41·00
Rugg Tel. Co.	Outram		7,000 00	7,050 00	315 00	171 00	3			111·00
Redvers Independent Tel. Co.	Redvers	1,025 00		1,203 00			19			
Saskatchewan Government Telephones	Regina		4,993,545 62	4,993,545 62	705,768 82	444,538 52	*15,824	331	338,743 60	67,850 00
Sutherland Tel. Co.	Saskatoon	1,200 00		1,200 00	129 60	90 00	8			27 00
Swanston Tel. Co.	Govan	6,750 00		7,335 00			49			200·00
Springcreek-Coverdale Tel. Co.	Moosomin	3,850 00		3,877 00	675 00	189 00	30		50 00	111·00
Saltcoats Tel. Co	Saltcoats	6,700 00		8,743 00	2,106 00	1,735 00	89		262 00	288·00
Sunnyhill Tel. Co.	Briercrest	2,300 00		4,300 00	443 00	441 00	21		20 00	74·00
Silverton Tel. Co	Carnduff	1,825 00		1,750 00	315 00	302 00	24		91 00	45·00
Stony Beach Tel. Co.	Belle Plains	5,500 00		5,166 00	537 00	571 00	57	2	523 00	198·00
Summerside Tel. Co.	Caron	4,537 00		4,172 00		545 00	35	1	125 00	114·00
South Antler Tel. Co.	Carnduff	1,100 00		1,100 00	168 00	115 00	14	1	28 00	26·00
South Regina Tel. Co.	Regina	1,000 00		939 00	181 00	144 00	9			18·00
Stoughton Tel. Co.	Stoughton	4,100 00		4,203 00	138 00	83 00	41		50 00	82·00
Sedley Tel. Co.	Sedley	3,240 00		3,240 00	289 00	205 00	23			94·00
Spring Coulee Tel. Co	Sintaluta	1,175 00		1,164 00	204 00	180 00	10		15 00	24·00
Sunny South Tel. Co.	Indian Head	1,050 00		1,059 00	422 00	247 00	12	1	15 00	24·00
South Carievale Tel. Co	Carievale	1,125 00		1,026 00	120 00	108 00	14		10 00	26·00
Stanley Tel. Co.	Moosomin	1,000 00		1,140 00	182 00	169 00	12		15 00	28·00
Springdale Tel. Co.	Regina	1,725 00		1,509 00	130 00	108 00	11			26·00
South Gainsboro Tel. Co.	Gainsboro	2,800 00		2,746 00	279 00	217 00	27	1	150 00	76·00
South Welwyn Tel. Co.	Welwyn	1,500 00		1,460 00	165 00	5 00	11			21·00
Sherwood Tel. Co.	Regina	4,375 00		4,000 00	613 00	512 00	31	2	139 00	92·00
South Pense Tel. Co.	Pense	1,200 00		1,181 00	84 00	55 00	11			32·00
St. Andrew Tel. Co.	Wapella	1,100 00		1,095 00	316 00	277 00	10		16·00	32·00

*Including 9906 operated by Central energy.

TABLE 5.—Statement of Capital, Cost, Revenue, Operating Expenses, Number of Telephones, Wire Equipment, etc.—*Con.*

Name of Company.	Address.	Capital Stock.	Funded Debt.	Cost Property and Equipment.	Revenue.	Operating Expenses.	Number of Telephones.	Employees and Remuneration.		Miles of Wire.
							Magneto.	No.	Amount.	
Saskatchewan—Con.		$ cts.	$ cts.	$ cts.	$ cts.	$ cts.			$ cts.	Miles.
Sarawak Tel. Co.	Belle Plains	1,100 00		1,018 00		5 00	12			22·00
South Arcola Tel. Co.	Arcola	4,375 00		4,237 00	600 00	319 00	30		35 00	105·00
Stewart Valley-Leinan Tel. Co.	Stewart Vellay	2,150 00		2,063 00		120 00	12			52·00
Sunrise Tel. Co.	Grand Coulee	1,200 00		923 00	80 00	103 00	12		9 00	16·00
Summerhill Tel. Co.	Grenfell	1,125 00		1,135 00	108 00	158 00	11			26·00
Superior Tel. Co.	Swift Current	1,750 00		1,750 00		24 00	13		24 00	32·00
South Carlyle Tel. Co.	Carlyle	1,150 00		1,032 00	210 00	189 00	6		38 00	28·00
Sydenham Tel. Co.	Guernsey	2,050 00		2,600 00	350 00	345 00	20	1	110 00	44·00
Summerberry Tel. Co.	Summerberry	4,950 00		4,900 00	824 00	607 00	40	2	4 00	95·00
South Boharm Tel. Co.	Moosejaw	1,467 00		1,371 00	108 00	97 00	10			26·00
Semans Tel. Co.	Semans	5,325 00		6,055 00	929 00	984 00	35		100 00	112·00
Strassburg Tel. Co.	Strassburg	450 00		428 00		11 00	6			6·00
Sunny North Tel. Co.	Southey	1,125 00		1,023 00	45 00	39 00	9			25·00
Swift Creek Tel. Co.	Carlyle	1,200 00		1,200 00	69 00	99 00	12		33 00	20·00
Saline Tel. Co.	Tate	2,250 00		2,084 00	517 00	392 00	18			54·00
Springbrook Tel. Co.	Fort Qu'Appelle	1,250 00		1,087 00	100 00	71 00	10		10 00	20 00
South Maryfield Tel. Co.	Maryfield	3,275 00		3,275 00	425 00	398 00	27	1	156 00	81·00
Seaforth Tel. Co.	Simpson		7,200 00	7,256 00	1,683 00	495 00	57	1	300 00	129·00
Seymour Tel. Co.	Carievale		5,300 00	5,039 00	136 00	82 00	21			75·00
Silton N. W. Tel. Co.	Silton		3,000 00	2,679 00	100 00	65 00	11			34·00
S. Bethune Tel. Co.	ethune		4,800 00	4,763 00	515 00	233 00	26			67·00
S. Churchbridge Tel. Co.	Churchbridge		8,800 00	8,716 00	379 00	231 00	42			126·00
S. Cupar Tel. Co.	Cupar		4,000 00	3,280 00	277 60	153 00	18			45·00
S. Forget Tel. Co.	Forget		10,000 00	9,175 00	249 00	147 00	45			149·00
S. Kisbey Tel. Co.	Kisbey		6,500 00	6,235 00	1,092 00	518 00	48	1	271 00	130·00
S. Langham Tel. Co.	Langham		7,500 00	7,500 00	250 00	181 00	50			143·00
S. Radisson Tel. Co.	Radisson		3,000 00	2,617 00	304 00	189 00	17			34·00
S. Valley Tel. Co.	Kindersley		4,200 00	3,932 00	105 00	99 00	14			54·00
Squirrel Hills Tel. Co.	Indian Head		1,600 00	1,653 00	353 00	343 00	10			25·00
Star Tel. Co.	Antler		7,800 00	8,513 00	611 00	332 00	49	3	315 00	154·00
Starr's Point Tel. Co.	Qu'Appelle		6,000 00	6,037 00	404 00	174 00	31			93·00
St. Elmo Tel. Co.	Griffin		3,000 00	2,425 00	60 00	69 00	14			36·00
Sunderland Tel. Co.	Kylemore		3,600 00	3,490 00	110 00	114 00	18			58·00
Sunnyside Tel. Co.	Leney		9,500 00	8,998 00	682 00	801 00	56	1	243 00	147·00
Swanson Tel. Co.	Swanson		8,600 00	7,690 00	449 00	429 00	39	1	185 00	102·00

Swift Creek Tel. Co.	Swift Creek		2,760 00	2,215 00	110 00	48 00	11			30·00
Simpson Independent Tel. Co.	Simpson	1,200 00		1,200 00	329 00	220 00	25	2		7·00
Sedley Independent Tel. Co.	Sedley	600 00		600 00			17			15·00
Theodore, Springside & Beaverdale Tel. Co.	Theodore	3,200 00		4,500 00	435 00	171 00	42		56 00	150·00
Tregarva Union Tel. Co.	Tregarva	4,050 00		4,620 00	857 00	600 00	45	2	230 00	150·00
Thunder Creek Tel. Co.	Carievale	925 00		984 00	88 00	81 00	13			27·00
Tugaske Tel. Co.	Tugaske	1,602 00		1,602 00		208 00	18			26·00
Teece Tel. Co.	Abernethy	750 00		776 00	24 00	24 00	6			16·00
Tantallon Tel. Co.	Tantallon		7,000 00	6,606 00	251 00	651 00	66	1		124·00
Third Meridian Tel. Co.	Davidson		5,200 00	5,154 00	155 00	81 00	29	1	35 00	68·00
Thorson Tel. Co.	Macoun		4,000 00	3,739 00	257 00	232 00	18			60·00
Troy Tel. Co.	Qu'Appelle		1,800 00	1,252 00	120 00	114 00	11			25·00
Truax Valley Tel. Co.	Truax		3,500 00	3,300 00	150 00	412 00	15			80·00
Tyvan Tel. Co.	Tyvan		3,700 00	3,825 00	145 00	137 00	19			48·00
Tate Independent Tel. Co.	Tate	1,250 00		1,114 00	338 00	313 00	11	1	300 00	3·00
Union Tel. Co.	Cupar	525 00		750 00	92 00	90 00	10			8·00
Victoria Tel. Co.	Regina	1,500 00		1,500 00	268 00	268 00	13			50·00
Vanscoy Tel. Co.	Vanscoy	1,850 00		1,830 00	850 00	606 00	25	1	100 00	50·00
Vernon Tel. Co.	Moosejaw	400 00		400 00	48 00	49 00	5			12·00
View Hill Tel. Co.	Estevan	2,850 00		2,600 00	301 00	258 00	23		50 00	70·00
Venn Tel. Co.	Venn	5,700 00		8,245 00	844 00	783 00	63	1	519 00	190·00
Vandura Tel. Co.	Vandura	1,650 00		1,549 00		55 00	11	1	45 00	29·00
Vibank Tel. Co.	Vibank	3,750 00		3,562 00	173 00	163 00	28		108 00	62·00
Valley Tel. Co.	Moosomin		2,200 00	2,100 00	100 00	50 00	10			34·00
Valley View Tel. Co.	Bladworth		2,000 00	1,759 00	86 00	69 00	6			22·00
Victor Tel. Co.	Saskatoon		5,700 00	5,700 00	120 00	43 00	26			82·00
Westfield Tel. Co.	Wolesley	2,950 00		2,265 00		287 00	24	1	91 00	44·00
Wideawake Tel. Co.	Indian Head	3,975 00		4,854 00	657 00	318 00	38		85 00	120·00
Weyburn Tel. Co.	Weyburn	9,375 00		9,375 00	1,582 00	1,618 00	77	9	74 00	234·00
Wilcox Mutual Tel. Co.	Wilcox	6,250 00		7,335 00			66	2	900 00	168·00
W. Weyburn Tel. Co.	Weyburn	350 00		350 00	10 00	10 00	5			10·00
Wheatland Tel. Co.	Carnduff	4,400 00		4,400 00	730 00	701 00	44			170·00
Wall Lake Tel. Co.	Dundurn	2,900 00		2,675 00		75 00	13		10 00	52·00
Willmer Tel. Co.	Arcola	5,000 00		5,000 00	800 00	726 00	38	2	479 00	98·00
Wascana Tel. Co.	Lumsden	2,600 00		2,500 00	314 00	317 00	25		93 00	68·00
Wheatbelt No. 2 Tel. Co.	Delisle	2,975 00		3,540 00	420 00	101 00	30	1	17 00	92·00
Wheatbelt No. 3 Tel. Co.	Delisle	3,300 00		2,100 00	605 00	605 00	31		65 00	124·00
Welwyn Tel. Co.	Welwyn	2,850 00		3,283 00	1,008 00	476 00	34		29 00	66·00
Wheatfield Tel. Co.	Perdue	975 00		1,002 00			9			25·00
W. Pioneer Tel. Co.	Moosejaw	1,650 00		1,492 00	110 00	108 00	10		10 00	34·00
Waldheim Tel. Co.	Waldheim	2,700 00		1,050 00	10 00	280 00	33	1	162 00	50·00
West View Tel. Co.	West View	5,100 00		5,372 00	803 00	747 00	32			146·00
Weldon Tel. Co.	Grenfell	3,900 00		3,900 00	509 00	501 00	28		35 00	90·00
Woodlands Tel. Co.	Moosomin	2,200 00		2,082 00	306 00	23 00	17		18 00	44·00
Wildwood Tel. Co.	Carlyle	1,300 00		1,400 00	240 00	123 00	12		20 00	36·00
Windon Tel. Co.	Wildheim	5,095 00		5,549 00	1,930 00	1,804 00	47	2	399 00	132·00
Wreford Tel. Co.	Nokomis	1,300 00		1,300 00	345 00	185 00	12			27·00
Watrous Tel. Co.	Watrous	1,280 00		1,235 00		55 00	9			22·00
Wheat Plains Tel. Co.	Broderick	3,600 00		3,600 00	140 00	330 00	28	1	355 60	96·00

TABLE 5.—Statement of Capital, Cost, Revenue, Operating Expenses, Number of Telephones, Wire Equipment, etc. *Con.*

Name of Company.	Address.	Capital Stock.	Funded Debt.	Cost Property and Equipment.	Revenue.	Operating Expenses.	Number of Telephones.	Employees and Remuneration.		Miles of Wire.
							Magneto.	No.	Amount.	
Saskatchewan—Con.		$ cts.	$ cts.	$ cts.	$ cts.	$ cts.			$ cts.	
Wilson Tel. Co.	Keeler	2,600 00		2,565 00	385 00	335 00	25	1	57 00	56·00
Warman Tel. Co.	Warman		7,200 00	7,381 00	230 00	226 00	31			90·00
Wessela Tel. Co.	Govan		5,200 00	5,176 00	467 00	379 00	31			85·00
Westbrook-Gladwin Tel. Co	Theodore		5,200 00	5,267 00	130 00	5 00	20			77·00
W. Fronde Tel. Co.	Fronde		3,000 00	3,000 00	171 00	130 00	20	2	98 00	40·00
W. Langham Tel. Co.	Langham		4,000 00	3,680 00	95 00	62 00	20			59·00
W. Osage Tel. Co.	Osage		5,300 00	4,410 00	125 00	146 00	26			47·00
Whitewood Tel. Co.	Whitewood		10,000 00	9,359 00	450 00	358 00	50			169·00
Wilberforce-Lampman Tel. Co	Lampman		6,500 00	6,250 00	410 00	149 00	30			90·00
Wilcox Independent Tel. Co	Wilcox		2,200 00	2,420 00	85 00	139 00	18			28·00
Willsmer Tel. Co.	Simpson		9,500 00	9,500 00	1,245 00	815 00	44			.....
Wood End Tel. Co.	Estevan		9,500 00	9,289 00	694 00	602 00	44			170·60
Yellow Grass Tel. Co.	Yellow Grass	7,600 00		10,839 00	2,010 00	190 00	137	2	1,700 00	333·00
Yorkton Tel. Co.	Yorkton	9,000 00		9,000 00	997 00	828 00	87	1	167 00	245·00
Young Tel. Co.	Young		8,000 00	8,018 00	272 00	215 00	43			110·00
Yellow Grass Independent Tel. Co	Yellow Grass	1,710 00		.....	558 00	326 00	62		25 00	15·00
Zorra McNutt Tel. Co.	McNutt		6,000 00	5,617 00	95 00	55 00	29			90·00
Total		880,975 00	6,063,695 62	6,886,793 62	916,960 82	616,127 52	*29,892	556	442,997 60	†103,978 00

*Includin 9,906 operated by Central energy. †51,330 Urban miles, 52,648 Rural miles (estimated).

Table 6.—Statement of Capital, Cost, Revenue, Operating Expenses, Number of Telephones, Employees, etc.

Name of Company.	Address.	Capital Stock.	Funded Debt.	Cost Property and Equipment.	Revenue.	Operating Expenses	Number of Telephones.		Employees and Remuneration.	
							Central.	Magneto	No.	Amount.
Nova Scotia.		$ cts.	$ cts.	$ cts.	$ cts.	$ cts.				$ cts
Abercrombie Mutual Tel. Co	Abercrombie			1,015 50	157 00	126 00		18	1	9 66
Athol Rural Tel. Co	Athol	326 00		369 35	191 46	191 46		12		
Barney's River Tel. Co	Upper Barneys River	4,600 00		1,914 17	160 00	160 00		25	1	148 50
Bayfield Road Tel. Co	Bayfield	46 80		46 80				6		
Bayview Mutual Tel. Co	Pictou	570 00		760 00	79 60	79 60		12		
Beacon Hill & Millburn Tel. Co	Beacon Hill			477 29	66 00	66 00		11		
Beaver Bank Tel. Co	Beaver Bank	554 85		554 85	79 71	79 71		8	1	12 56
Beech Hill Tel. Co	Beech Hill	441 55		441 55				3		
Belleville Rural Tel. Co	Belleville North	300 00		300 00	95 00	90 00		18	1	65 00
Belmont Tel. Co	Belmont	850 00		1,100 00	32 62	33 00		31	1	33 00
Blandford Tel. Co	Hubbards	1,800 00		1,800 00	351 53	106 50		11	10	65 00
Broad Cove Tel. Co	Broad Cove	300 00		300 00	65 00	50 00		2		
Brooklyn Tel. Co., Ltd	Brooklyn	4,215 00	700 00	6,054 00	1,406 60	1,350 05		100	2	720 00
Brookvale Tel. Co	Brookvale	360 00		430 00	44 34	20 00		9		
Bridgetown & Dalhousie West Tel. Co	Dalhousie West	425 00		630 00	84 35	73 24		8	1	10 00
Caledonia Mills Tel. Co	Caledonia Mills			806 00	45 00	45 00		8	1	13 00
Caledonia Mutual Tel. Co	Caledonia	1,044 45		1,044 45	10 50	10 50		6		
Canaan Tel. Co	Canaan			290 00	40 00	40 00		5		
Carleton Tel. Co., Ltd	Kemptville	1,500 00		1,680 00	445 98	310 99		15	4	165 00
Central Caribou Tel. Co	Central Caribou	600 00		266 10	23 90	10 35		5		
Central New Annan Tel. Co	Central New Annan			680 00	100 00	100 00		25		
Chaswood Tel. Co	Chaswood			60 00	23 60	23 60		4		
Clam Harbour & Owls Head Tel. Co	Owl's Head	500 00		500 00	68 00	31 00		7		
Coastal Tel. Co	Bayside	2,000 00		3,000 00	641 66	381 38		20	3	350 00
Cole Harbour & Woodlawn Tel. Co	Dartmouth	650 00		650 00	143 68	143 68		12	1	15 00
Cumberland Tel. Co	Northport	2,100 00		1,500 00	1,000 00	890 00		79	2	200 00
Earltown Tel. Co	Earltown			432 37	86 10	86 10		6		
East Chezzetcook Tel. Co	East Chezzetcook			110 00	89 62	5 00		3		
Eastern Cole Harbour Tel. Co	Dartmouth			850 00	9 00	9 00		15		
East Inglesville Tel. Co	East Inglesville			530 00	35 24	35 24		13		
East Leicester Tel. Co	Oxford			438 12	24 70	10 50		10		
East Pictou Tel. Co., Ltd	Kings Head	1,350 00	1,000 00	3,500 00	1,012 43	893 92		48	4	485 00
East River Mutual Tel. Co	Springville			1,258 00	250 00	250 00		73	1	195 00
East Stewiacke Tel. Co	Stewiacke	350 00		350 00	127 86	127 86		17		
East Wallace Tel. Co	East Wallace	236 00		236 00	30 00	30 00		6		

TABLE 6:—Statement of Capital, Cost, Revenue, Operating Expenses, Number of Telephones, Employees, etc—*Concluded.*

Name of Company.	Address.	Capital Stock.	Funded Debt.	Cost Property and Equipment.	Revenue.	Operating Expenses.	Number of Telephones.		Employees and Remuneration.	
							Central.	Magneto	No.	Amount.
Nova Scotia—Con.		$ cts.	$ cts.	$ cts.	$ cts	$ cts.				$ cts.
East Wentworth Tel. Co	East Wentworth			325 00	36 85	13 00		10		
Ellershouse Tel. Co	Ellershouse	70 00		120 00	40 00	35 00		5		
Falls Mutual Tel. Co	The Falls			920 00	200 00	138 00		18	1	15 00
Farmers Tel. Co	Grafton			24,472 32	5,741 34	5,425 92		452	6	1,424 00
Forks Baddeck Tel. Co	Baddeck Forks	362 00		700 00	40 00	40 00		19		
Fox Harbour Tel. Co	Fox Harbour Point			450 00	10 00	5 00		18		
Gabarouse Tel. Co	Louisburg			439 00	108 00	89 58		7		
Glengarry Tel. Co	Hopewell			622 00				15		
Goffs & Oldham Tel. Co	Goffs	365 00		375 88	86 02	93 16		4		
Grand Mira Tel. Co	Grand Mira			7,528 00	639 10	132 15		75	3	10 50
Greenfield Tel. Co	Greenfield	1,186 80		1,186 80	189 95	18 54		20	1	10 00
Hammonds Plains Tel. Co	Bedford	500 00		800 00	181 14	145 15		11	1	10 00
Harrison Road Tel. Co	Mecan			278 72	47 00	47 00		7		
Head of Wallace Bay Tel. Co	Wallace Bay South			296 00	7 75	6 62		14		
Heathbell & Plainfield Tel. Co	Plainfield			400 00	100 00	10 00		26	1	10 00
Heatherton Mutual Tel. Co	Glassburn	2,213 40		2,213 40	4 00	4 00		36		
Hillsburn Tel. Co	Hillsburn			200 00	90 00	87 61		3		
Hillside Tel. Co	Hillside	600 00		600 00	66 00	66 00		9		
Indian Point Tel. Co	Indian Point	150 00		150 00	27 00	10 00		1		
Isle Madam Tel. Co	Arichat	2,500 00		3,712 00	647 77	345 00		20	4	325 00
Jeddore Tel. Co	Smith's Settlement			875 00	150 00	61 00		15		
Jordan Bay Tel. Co	Jordan Bay	430 00	150 00	702 45	86 60	37 35		7	1	8 00
Jordan Tel. Co	East Jordan	125 00		200 00	40 00	10 00		4		
Lake La Rose Tel. Co	Annapolis Royal			472 77	41 87	41 87		6		
Lakevale Mutual Tel. Co	Lakevale			2,870 00	150 00	125 00		20	1	60 00
Lawrencetown Tel. Co	Lawrencetown	2,030 95		1,815 00	304 39	235 81		30	1	25 00
Le Blanc Tel. Co	Salmon River	106 03		106 03	26 05	19 20		3	2	10 85
Lorne Mutual Tel. Co	Hopewell	342 00		620 00	40 00	35 00		30	1	20 00
Lovat Mutual Tel. Co	Lovat	250 00		1,080 00	41 72	41 72		18		
Malagash Tel. Co	North Shore Malagash	300 00		300 00	7 00	7 00		13	1	5 00
Maitland & Noel Tel. Co	Noel	1,800 00		2,430 00	668 02	270 00		35		
Maple Leaf Tel. Co	Merigomish	4,661 90		4,661 90	1,204 70	804 86		83	3	500 00
Mapleton Tel. Co	Leamington	1,140 00		1,160 00	88 83	88 83		29	1	32 08
Maritime Teleg. & Tel. Co., Ltd	Halifax	1,850,000 00	1,500,000 00	3,477,483 92	644,206 94	396,151 80	13,238	5,129	670	286,101 52
Meadowgreen Tel. Co	St. Andrews			900 00	55 00	55 00		13		
Melbourne Tel. Co	Arcadia			924 91	270 34	177 43		11	1	10 00
Middle River Tel. Co	Westville	3,500 00		2,310 02	460 00	460 00		60	3	200 00
Middlebro Tel. Co	Hartford	100 00		100 00	7 00	7 00		26		
Milford Tel. Co	Milford			250 00	155 00	100 00		11	1	30 00

Millsville & Roger's Hill Tel. Co.	Roger's Hill Centre	500 00		550 00	123 45	123 45		14		
Mineville Tel. Co.	Mineville			477 70	35 00	35 00		8	3	15 00
Mount Pleasant Tel. Co.	Mount Pleasant	200 00		200 00	25 00	25 00		2		
Murchyville Tel. Co.	Murchyville	470 00	120 00	470 00	48 00	48 00		12		
Musquodoboit Harbour Tel. Co.	Musquodoboit Harbour			550 00	795 00	780 00		28		
New Albany Tel. Co.	New Albany	700 00		650 00	160 00	148 50		15	3	60 00
New Ross Tel. Co.	New Ross	5,250 00		5,250 00	1,100 00	800 00		46	2	600 00
New Tusket Tel. Co.	New Tusket			100 00	325 00	100 00		20		
New Victoria Tel. Co.	Hartford	4,700 00		4,700 00	240 00	240 00		46	1	10 00
North Shore Tel. Co.	Georgeville			1,500 00	80 00	50 00		21		
North Wallace Tel. Co.	Fox Harbour	170 00		170 00	37 49	37 49		14		5 00
Ohio Tel. Co.	Lower Ohio	600 00		600 00	33 00	33 00		11	1	3 50
Ostrea Lake Tel. Co.	Ostrea Lake	350 00		378 75	34 60	12 75		5	1	10 00
Paradise West Tel. Co.	Bridgetown	325 00		325 00	75 00	75 00		12		
Pleasant Harbour Tel. Co.	Pleasant Harbour	362 73		362 73	190 00			6		
Port La Tour Tel. Co.	Baccaro	1,010 00		4,150 00	1,199 62	1,114 01		50	2	225 00
Port Lorne Tel. Co.	Port Lorne	200 00		165 00	45 00	20 00		5	2	20 00
Port Medway Tel. Co.	Port Medway			150 00	90 00	90 00		6		
Princeport Tel. Co.	Old Barns			600 00	120 00	110 00		16	1	22 00
Pugwash Junction Tel. Co.	Pugwash Junction			400 00	100 00	43 00		16		
River Dennis Tel. Co.	River Dennis			980 93	26 96	26 96		11		
Riverside Tel. Co.	Lower Stewiacke	1,252 11		1,607 11	171 70	171 70		25		
Roseway River Tel. Co.	Upper Ohio	903 83		903 83	96 52	96 52		12		
Royal Centre & Minto Tel. Co.	Meadowville			256 60	36 00	24 00		12		
Sackville Tel. Co., Ltd.	Sackville	450 00			120 00	90 00		14	1	55 00
Salem Tel. Co.	Amherst			400 00	180 63	190 83		14		
Saltsprings Tel. Co.	Saltsprings			576 00				18		
Sanford & Short Beach Tel. Co.	Sanford	500 00		1,000 00	361 00	192 00		18		
Springfield Mutual Tel. Co.	Lower Springfield			700 00	84 50	84 50		13		
South Alton Tel. Co.	South Alton			315 14	48 00	48 00		8		
South River Mutual Tel. Co.	Fraser's Mills	2,750 00		3,000 00	400 00	400 00		70	2	400 00
South West Margaree Tel. Co.	South W. Margaree			350 00	20 00	1 00		2		
St. Ann's Tel. Co.	Quarry St. Ann's			500 00	160 00	160 00		16		
St. Marys Mutual Tel. Co., Ltd.	Glenelg	1,275 00	744 00	2,610 79	270 00	270 00		48	2	144 00
Surrettes Island Tel. Co.	Amirault Hill	400 00		679 79	256 90	75 95		8		
Toney River Tel. Co.	Toney Mills			400 00	62 00	27 00		12		
Tor Bay Tel. Co.	Larry's River			819 00				23	1	45 00
Union Tel. Co.	Blue Mountain	2,160 00		3,275 00	1,056 47	952 03		60	2	160 00
Upper Sackville Tel. Co.	Middle Sackville			300 00	50 00	50 00		14		
Wallace Bay Tel. Line	Wallace Bay	275 00		275 00	5 00	5 00		13		
Wallace River Tel. Co.	Head of Wallace Bay	386 00		386 00	15 00	12 00		16	1	8 00
Wallace Union Tel. Co.	Wallace Station			300 00	40 00	40 00		10		
Wentworth Valley Tel. Co.	Wentworth Station			600 00	199 39	199 39		25		
Western Head Tel. Co.	Liverpool			475 00	51 00	40 00		3		
West New Annan Tel. Co.	West New Annan	620 00		620 00	10 00	10 00		13		
Westport & Digby Tel. Co.	Mink Cove			4,000 00	2,000 00	1,200 00		115	6	900 00
West River Tel. Co.	Saltsprings	252 00		2,024 00	545 00	345 00		54	1	25 00
West Wentworth Tel. Co.	Greenville Sta.	560 00		1,089 68	28 80	28 80		16		
Wittenburg Tel. Co.	Wittenburg			100 00	25 00	25 00		4		
Total		1,924,504 37	1,502,714 00	3,631,862 02	674,321 69	419,826 58	13,238	7,972	766	293,986 17

Table 7.—Statement of Miles of Wire Equipment—Urban and Rural.

Name of Company.	Address.	Urban.					Rural.				
		Galvanized	Copper Wire.				Galvanized.	Copper Wire.			
		Single Wire.	Single Wire.	Overhead.	Underground.	Submarine.	Single Wire.	Single Wire.	Overhead.	Underground.	Submarine.
Nova Scotia.		Miles.	Miles.	Miles.	Miles.	Miles.	Miles.	Miles.	Miles.	Miles.	Miles.
Abercrombie Mutual Tel. Co.	Abercrombie						24·00				
Athol Rural Tel. Co.	Athol						19·00				
Barney's River Tel. Co.	Upper Barney's River						25·00				
Bayfield Road Tel. Co.	Bayfield						2·00				
Bayview Mutual Tel. Co.	Pictou						19·00				
Beacon Hill & Milburn Tel. Co.	Beacon Hill						16·50				
Beaver Bank Tel. Co.	Beaver Bank						10·50				
Beech Hill Tel. Co.	Beech Hill						16·00				
Belleville Rural Tel. Co.	Belleville North						12·00				
Belmont Tel. Co.	Belmont						25·00				
Blandford Tel. Co.	Hubbards						21·00				3·50
Broad Cove Tel. Co.	Broad Cove						7·00				
Brooklyn Tel. Co., Ltd.	Brooklyn						97·00				
Brookvale Tel. Co.	Brookvale						8·00				
Bridgetown & Dalhousie West Tel. Co.	Dalhousie West						14·00				
Caledonia Mills Tel. Co.	Caledonia Mills						10·50				
Caledonia Mutual Tel. Co.	Caledonia						36·00				
Canaan Tel. Co.	Canaan	2·00					8·00				
Carleton Tel. Co., Ltd.	Kemptville						55·00				
Central Caribou Tel. Co.	Central Caribou						3·00				
Central New Annan Tel. Co.	Central New Annan						40·00				
Chaswood Tel. Co.	Chaswood						2·50				
Clam Harbour & Owl's Head Tel. Co.	Owl's Head								10·00		
Coastal Tel. Co.	Bayside						70·00				
Cole Harbour & Woodlawn Tel. Co.	Dartmouth						9·00				
Cumberland Tel. Co.	Northport						136·00				
Earltown Tel. Co.	Earltown						24·00				
East Chezzetcook Tel. Co.	East Chezzetcook						2·75				
Eastern Cole Harbour Tel. Co.	Dartmouth						22·00				
East Inglesville Tel. Co.	East Inglesville						18·00				
East Leicester Tel. Co.	Oxford						18·00				
East Pictou Tel. Co.	Kings Head						85·00				
East River Mutual Tel. Co.	Springville						108·00				

East Stewiacke Tel. Co.	Stewiacke						6·50					
East Wallace Tel. Co.	East Wallace						8·00					
East Wentworth Tel. Co.	East Wentworth						6·50					
Ellershouse Tel. Co.	Ellershouse						3·00					
Falls Mutual Tel. Co.	The Falls						25·00	0·50				
Farmers Tel. Co.	Grafton						465·00					
Forks Baddeck Tel. Co.	Baddeck Forks						15·50					
Fox Harbour Tel. Co.	Fox Harbour Point						10 00					
Gabarouse Tel. Co.	Louisburg						16·00					
Glengarry Tel. Co.	Hopewell						7·00					
Goffs & Oldham Tel. Co.	Goffs						10·00					
Grand Mira Tel. Co.	Grand Mira						86,00					
Greenfield Tel. Co.	Greenfield						29·50					
Hammonds Plains Tel. Co.	Bedford						32·00					
Harrison Road Tel. Co.	Meccan						8·00					
Head of Wallace Bay Tel. Co.	Wallace Bay South						7·00					
Heathbell & Plainfield Tel. Co.	Plainfield						19·00					
Heatherton Mutual Tel. Co.	Glassburn						26·25					
Hillsburn Tel. Co.	Hillsburn						6·50					
Hillside Tel. Co.	Hillside						9·75					
Indian Point Tel. Co.	Indian Point						3·00					
Isle Madam Tel. Co.	Arichat						30·00					
Jeddore Tel. Co.	Smith's Settlement						14·00					
Jordan Bay Tel. Co.	Jordan Bay						10·25					
Jordan Tel. Co.	East Jordan						8·00					
Lake La Rose Tel. Co.	Annapolis Royal						8·00					
Lakevale Mutual Tel. Co.	Lakevale						59·00	1·00				
Lawrencetown Tel. Co.	Lawrencetown						40·00					
Le Blanc Tel. Co.	Salmon River						8·00					
Lorne Mutual Tel. Co.	Hopewell						12·00					
Lovat Mutual Tel. Co.	Lovat						10·00					
Malagash Tel. Co.	North Shore Malagash						12·00					
Maitland & Noel Tel. Co.	Noel						61·00					
Maple Leaf Tel. Co.	Merigomish						160·00					
Mapleton Tel. Co.	Leamington						34·00					
Maritime Teleg. & Tel. Co., Ltd.	Halifax	1,359·00	2,086·00	10,812·00	10,849·00	84·00	7,040·00	1,471·00	265·00		33·00	
Meadowgreen Tel. Co.	St. Andrews						24·00					
Melbourne Tel. Co.	Arcadia						13·50					
Middle River Tel. Co.	Westville						50·00					
Middleboro Tel. Co.	Hartford						15·00					
Milford Tel. Co.	Milford						14·00					
Millsville & Roger's Hill Tel. Co.	Roger's Hill Centre						20·00					
Mineville Tel. Co.	Mineville						6·50					
Mount Pleasant Tel. Co.	Mount Pleasant						3·25					
Murchyville Tel. Co.	Murchyville						7·50					
Musquodoboit Harbour Tel. Co.	Musquodoboit Harbour						13·00					
New Albany Tel. Co.	New Albany						15·00					
New Ross Tel. Co.	New Ross						47·00					
New Tusket Tel. Co.	New Tusket						28 50					
New Victoria Tel. Co.	Hartford						100·00					

TABLE 7.—Statement of Miles of Wire Equipment—Urban and Rural.—*Concluded.*

Name of Company.	Address.	Urban.					Rural.				
		Galvanized	Copper Wire.				Galvanized.	Copper Wire.			
		Single Wire.	Single Wire.	Overhead.	Underground.	Submarine.	Single Wire.	Single Wire.	Overhead.	Underground.	Submarine.
Nova Scotia—Con.		Miles.	Miles.	Miles.	Miles.	Miles.	Miles.	Miles.	Miles.	Miles.	Miles.
North Shore Tel. Co.	Georgeville						63·00				
North Wallace Tel. Co.	Fox Harbour						18·00				
Ohio Tel. Co.	Lower Ohio						16·00				
Ostrea Lake Tel. Co.	Ostrea Lake						14·00				
Paradise West Tel. Co.	Bridgetown						4·00				
Pleasant Harbour Tel. Co.	Pleasant Harbour						15·00				
Port La Tour Tel. Co.	Baccaro						80·00				2·50
Port Lorne Tel. Co.	Port Lorne						8·00				
Port Medway Tel. Co.	Port Medway						5·00				
Princeport Tel. Co.	Old Barns						12·00				
Pugwash Junction Tel. Co.	Pugwash Junction						7·00				
River Dennis Tel. Co.	River Dennis						26·00				
Riverside Tel. Co.	Riverside						35·50				
Roseway River Tel. Co.	Upper Ohio						11·00				
Royal Centre & Minto Tel. Co.	Meadowville						5·00				
Sackville Tel. Co.	Sackville						6·50				
Salem Tel. Co.	Amherst						24·00				
Saltsprings Tel. Co.	Saltsprings						17·50				
Sanford & Short Beach Tel. Co.	Sanford						16·00				
Springfield Mutual Tel. Co.	Lower Springfield						25·00				
South Alton Tel. Co.	South Alton						12·00				
South River Mutual Tel. Co.	Fraser Mills						48·00				
South West Margaree Tel. Co.	South W. Margaree						12·00				
St. Ann's Tel. Co.	Quarry St. Ann's						25·00				
St. Marys Mutual Tel. Co.	Glenelg						104·00				
Surrettes Island Tel. Co.	Amirault Hill						15·50				
Toney River Tel. Co.	Toney River						8·00				
Tor Bay Tel. Co.	Larry's River						70·00				
Union Tel. Co.	Blue Mountain						60·00				
Upper Sackville Tel. Co.	Middle Sackville						6·00				
Wallace Bay Tel. Line	Wallace Bay						10·00				
Wallace River Tel. Co.	Head of Wallace Bay						18·00				
Wallace Union Tel. Co.	Wallace Station						8·00				

Wentworth Valley Tel. Co.	Wentworth Station												12·00						
Western Head Tel. Co.	Liverpool												5·00						
West New Annan Tel. Co.	West New Annan												28·00						
Westport & Digby Tel. Co.	Mink Cove			20·00									60·00					2·00	
West River Tel. Co.	Saltsprings												48·00						
West Wentworth Tel. Co.	Grenville Sta.												16·00						
Wittenburg Tel. Co.	Wittenburg		2·00										8·00						
Total		1,363·00	2,106·00	10,812·00	10,849·00	84·00	10,586·25	4,472·50	275·00			2·00	41·00						

TABLE 8.—Statement of Capital Cost, Revenue, Operating Expenses, Number of Telephones, Employees, etc.

Name of Company.	Address.	Capital Stock.	Funded Debt.	Cost Property and Equipment.	Revenue.	Operating Expenses.	Number of Telephones.		Employees and Remuneration.	
							Central.	Magneto	No.	Amount.
New Brunswick.		$ cts.	$ cts.	$ cts.	$ cts.	$ cts.				$ cts.
Acadia Tel. Co	Rogersville	3,000 00		3,000 00	450 00	325 00		25	3	225 00
Adamsville Tel. Co., Ltd	Adamsville	3,500 00		1,500 00	150 00	70 00		13	1	30 00
Berry's Mills Tel. Co	Berry's Mills	565 00		565 00	200 86	200 86		16		
Blissville & Petersville Tel. Co	Hoyt	1,800 00		1,800 00	260 00	34 00		27		
Canterbury & North Lake Tel. Co	Fosterville	2,286 66	200 00	2,500 00	596 25	470 25		37	5	280 50
Citizens Tel. Co., Ltd	St. Stephen	3,512 00	3,050 00	6,562 00			50			
Clark Private Line	Lawrence Station			300 00	12 00	12 00		13		
Consolidated Tel. Co., Ltd	Bath	12,215 15		12,215 15	2,797 60	1,582 51		315	4	1,150 00
Corn Hill Tel. Co	Corn Hill			950 00	25 00	25 00		28		
Dorn Ridge Tel. Co	Burtts Corner			200 00				13		
Farmers Tel. Co., Ltd	Hartland	27,600 00	6,500 00	34,000 00	6,500 00	4,293 95		500	8	2,018 00
Grand Manan Tel. Co., Ltd	Grand Manan	5,400 00		6,000 00	2,776 00	1,025 03		140	5	828 28
Moorehouse-Blackville Tel. Co., Ltd	Moorehouse	1,500 00		1,500 00	200 00	150 00		23	1	100 00
New Brunswick Coal & Ry. Tel. Co	Fredericton				62 16	62 16		8		
New Brunswick Tel. Co., Ltd	St. John	1,259,540 00	100,000 00	1,730,699 58	460,136 24	254,485 02	9,664	6,235	396	155,332 41
Morton & Springfield Tel. Co	Norton	1,250 00		,200 00	5 00	5 00		26		
Sherwood Private Line	Hillsboro	860 00		860 00	138 32	59 13		14	14	53 38
St. Martins Ry. Co. Tel. Line	St. John				160 85	120 52		5		
St. Martins Tel. Co., Ltd	St. John	3,490 00		3,500 00	1,461 80	802 32		8	1	178 00
Sullivan Tel. Line	Bonny River			250 00				2		
Tracy Tel. Co	Tracy Station	500 00		700 00	250 00	200 00		27	7	150 00
Wellsford & Hamstead Mutual Tel. Co	Wellsford	1,060 00		961 30	280 00	145 00		18	1	60 00
West Isles Tel. Co., Ltd	Lords Cove	3,000 00		4,000 00	1,000 00	400 00		71	1	275 00
Wickham & Springfield Mutual Tel. Co	Shannon Settlement	1,050 00		1,604 40				31		
York & Carleton Tel. Co	Debec Junction	7,000 00	9,999 00	8,000 00	1,345 00	600 00		128	3	600 00
York & Charlotte Tel. Co., Ltd	Harvey Station			500 00	80 00	80 00		80	1	80 00
Total		1,339,128 81	119,749 00	1,823,367 43	478,887 08	265,157	759,714	7,803	451	161,460 57

Table 9.—Statement of Miles of Wire Equipment—Urban and Rural.

Name of Company.	Address.	Urban.					Rural.				
		Galvanized	Cooper Wire.				Galvanized.	Copper Wire.			
		Single Wire.	Single Wire.	Overhead.	Underground.	Submarine.	Single Wire.	Single Wire.	Overhead.	Underground.	Submarine.
New Brunswick.		Miles.	Miles.	Miles.	Miles.	Miles.	Miles.	Miles.	Miles.	Miles.	Miles.
Acadia Tel. Co.	Rogersville						40 00				
Adamsville Tel. Co., Ltd.	Adamsville						15 00				
Berry's Mills Tel. Co.	Berry's Mills						16 00				
Blissville & Petersville Tel. Co.	Hoyt						14 00				
Canterbury & North Lake Tel. Co.	Fosterville						66 00				
Citizens Tel. Co., Ltd.	St. Stephen			140 00							
Clark Private Line	Lawrence Station						12 00				
Consolidated Tel. Co., Ltd.	Bath						250 00				
Corn Hill Tel. Co.	Corn Hill						9 00				
Dorn Ridge Tel. Co.	Burtts Corner						8 00				
Farmers Tel. Co., Ltd.	Hartland						500 00	4 00			
Grand Manan Tel. Co., Ltd.	Grand Manan						110 00				
Moorehouse-Blackville Tel. Co., Ltd.	Moorehouse						25 00				
New Brunswick Coal & Ry. Tel. Co.	Fredericton						45 00				
New Brunswick Tel. Co., Ltd.	St. John	6,234·02	648·03	5,859·41	5,518·91	44·80	4,042·22	3,771·58			25·99
Norton & Springfield Tel. Co.	Norton						30·00				
Sherwood Private Line	Hillsboro						45·00				
St. Martins Ry. Co. Tel. Line	St. John						30·00				
St. Martins Tel. Co., Ltd.	St. John		3·00				47·00				
Sullivan Tel. Line	Bonny River						7·00				
Tracy Tel. Co.	Tracy Station						20·00				
Wellsford & Hamstead Mutual Tel. Co.	Wellsford						30 00				
West Isles Tel. Co., Ltd.	Lords Cove						45·00				6·00
Wickham & Springfield Mutual Tel. Co.	Shannon Settlement						20·00				
York & Carleton Tel. Co.	Debec Junction						80·00				
York & Charlotte Tel. Co., Ltd.	Harvey Station						90 00				
Total		6,234·02	651·03	5,999·41	5,518·91	44·80	5,596·22	3,775·58			31·99

TABLE 10.—Statement of Capital, Cost, Revenue, Operating Expenses, Number of Telephones, Employees, etc.

Name of Company.	Address.	Capital Stock.	Funded Debt.	Cost Property and Equipment.	Revenue.	Operating Expenses.	Number of Telephones.		Employees and Remuneration.	
							Central.	Magneto	No.	Amount.
Manitoba.		$ cts.	$ cts.	$ cts.	$ cts.	$ cts.				$ cts.
Bidford Farmers' Line	Deloraine			1,960 00	133 60	127 50		10		
Brett Tel. Co.	Dugald			100 00	4 00	4 00		4		
Clearwater Tel. Co., Ltd	Clearwater	8,000 00	2,000 00	8,000 00	860 00	700 00		82	1	595 00
Coombs & Bryson Tel. Co.	Deloraine			1,350 00	73 48	35 20		10	1	10 00
Dugald Tel. Co.	Dugald			650 00	48 00	48 00		8		
Edie-Morrison Tel. Co.	Dugald			270 00	150 30	150 30		11		
Gowancroft Tel. Co.	Pilot Mound			585 00	33 00	33 00		5		
Independent Tel. Co.	Dugald	700 00		900 00	125 00	125 00		13	1	10 00
Lake Francis Tel. Co.	Woodlands	460 00	300 00	1,230 00	540 45	120 00		50	1	120 00
Lonsboro Tel. Co.	Pilot Mound	300 00		300 00	54 00	54 00		6		
Louise Tel. Co.	Crystal City	10,000 00		10,000 00	1,750 00	1,650 00		146	5	1,450 00
Louise Tel. Co.	Snowflake			1,955 00	184 00	184 00		23		
Macdonald Tel. Co., Municipality of	Sanford		40,000 00	44,400 00	5,646 49	3,086 92		271	3	2,460 00
Manitoba Government Telephones	Winnipeg		10,386,025 96	10,386,025 96	1,781,823 95	1,385,736 41	29,481	15,141	1,130	813,550 61
Mariapolis Tel. Co.	Mariapolis			1,200 00	127 90	123 64		16		
Miniota Tel. Co., Municipality of	Miniota		66,000 00	68,060 00	10,049 80	6,944 86		378	7	4,252 21
Mountainside Tel. Co.	Deloraine			1,657 00	124 00	124 60		20		
Municipal Tel. Co.	Dugald			250 00	179 10	179 10		14		
Oak Bank Tel. Co.	Dugald			400 00	200 00	15 25		13	1	15 25
Percy Tel. Co.	Dugald			390 00	7 00	7 00		13		
Pipestone Tel. Co., Municipal	Reston		65,000 00	67,618 38	9,218 80	7,718 88		380	2	1,900 00
Plympton Tel. Co.	Plympton			1,200 00	592 00	380 50		24	1	23 09
Prairie Grove Tel. Co.	Meadow Vale			250 00	149 00	149 00		8	2	12 00
Robertson Tel. Co.	Boissevain			75 00	25 90	25 00		2		
Rosewood & St. Anns Tel. Co.	St. Anns	400 00		325 00	20 00	20 00		20		
Snyder Tel. Co.	Portage la Prairie	500 00		500 00	15 00	15 00		2		
South Transcona Tel. Co.	Transcona			400 00	134 00	134 00		6		
Steinbach Tel. Co.	Steinbach	280 00		300 00	388 00	210 00		140	1	200 00
Strathcona Tel. Co. (Municipal)	Belmont		39,000 00	39,200 00	6,407 66	4,298 77		233	8	2,499 85
St. Rose du Lac Tel. Co.	St. Rose du Lac			450 00	13 50	13 50		18		
Suthwyn Tel. Co.	Winnipeg	132 29		334 29	39 00	39 00		7	1	
Thirlstane Tel. Co.	Deloraine			378 00	8 00	8 00		9		
Union Farmers' Tel. Line	Necpawa	1,000 00		900 00	94 50	57 40		9	1	5 50
Wallace Tel. Co., Municipality of	Virden		70,000 00	58,832 71	12,890 01	12,332 41		351	2	2,040 00
Wilson Tel. Co.	Dugald		72 00					3		
Winkler Tel. Co.	Winkler	1,425 00		1,365 00	120 00	120 60		17		
Wood Bay Tel. Co.	Wood Bay	1,050 00		1,300 00	135 00	135 00		13	1	12 50
Woodworth Tel. Co.	Kenton	3,349 25	55,000 00	56,078 74	8,971 85	8,082 20		338	5	3,160 00
Total		27,596 54	10,723,397 96	10,758,230 08	1,850,997 49	1,422,062 20	29,481	17,798	1,174	832,315 82

Table 11.—Statement of Miles of Wire Equipment—Urban and Rural.

Name of Company.	Address.	Urban.					Rural.				
		Galvanized.	Copper Wire.				Galvanized.	Copper. Wire.			
		Single Wire.	Single Wire.	Overhead.	Underground.	Submarine.	Single Wire.	Single Wire.	Overhead.	Underground.	Submarine.
Manitoba.		Miles.	Miles.	Miles.	Miles.	Miles.	Miles.	Miles.	Miles.	Miles.	Miles.
Bidford Farmers' Line	Deloraine						20·00				
Brett Tel. Co	Dugald						1·25				
Clearwater Tel. Co., Ltd	Clearwater						74·00				
Coombs & Bryson Tel. Co	Deloraine						18·50				
Dugald Tel. Co	Dugald						6·50				
Edie-Morrison Tel. Co	Dugald						12·00				
Gowaneroft Tel. Co	Pilot Mound						2·50				
Independent Tel. Co	Dugald						12·00				
Lake Francis Tel. Co	Woodlands						50·00				
Lonsboro Tel. Co	Pilot Mound						5·00				
Louise Tel. Co	Crystal City	22·00		12·00			100·00				
Louise Tel. Co	Snowflake						38·00				
Macdonald Tel. Co., Municipality of	Sanford						270·00	1·00	1·00		
Manitoba Government Telephones	Winnipeg			35,167·00	73,112·00		44,618·00	13,626.00			
Mariapolis Tel. Co	Mariapolis						22·00				
Miniota Tel. Co., Municipality of	Miniota						800·00		22·00		
Mountainside Tel. Co	Deloraine						56·00				
Municipal Tel. Co	Dugald						5·00				
Oak Bank Tel. Co	Dugald						25·00				
Percy Tel. Co	Dugald						2·00				
Pipestone Tel. Co., Municipal	Reston	3·00		19·00			1,061·00				
Plympton Tel. Co	Plympton						23·50				
Prairie Grove Tel. Co	Meadow Vale						16·00				
Robertson Tel. Co	Boissevain						0·75				
Rosewood & St Anns Tel. Co	St. Anns						2·00				
Synder Tel. Co	Portage la Prairie						2·50				
South Transcona Tel. Co	Transcona	5·50					2·50				
Steinbach Tel. Co	Steinbach						2·00				
Stratheona Tel. Co. (Municipal)	Belmont						200·00		20·00		
St. Rose du Lac Tel. Co	St. Rose du Lac						2·00				
Suthwyn Tel. Co	Winnipeg						7·00				
Thirlstane Tel. Co	Deloraine						5·00				
Union Farmers' Tel. Line	Neepawa						9·00				
Wallace Tel Co., Municipality of	Virden						1,200·00				
Wilson Tel. Co	Dugald						5·00				
Winkler Tel. Co	Winkler						14·00				
Wood Bay Tel. Co	Wood Bay						25·00				
Woodworth Tel. Co	Kenton						950 00				
Total		30·50		35,198·00	73,112·00		48,643·00	13,627.00	43·00		

TABLE 12.—Statement of Capital, Cost, Revenue, Operating Expenses, Number of Telephones, Employees, etc.

Name of Company.	Address.	Capital Stock.	Funded Debt.	Cost Property and Equipment.	Revenue.	Operating Expenses.	Number of Telephones.		Employees and Remuneration.	
							Central.	Magneto	No.	Amount.
Alberta.		$ cts.	$ cts.	$ cts.	$ cts.					$ cts.
Crossfield & Samsontown Mutual Tel. Co.	Crossfield	1,111 60		1,516 00	63 00	63 00		20		
Government of Alberta Tel. Lines	Edmonton		8,901,960 00	8,552,087 07	888,720 61	529,718 82	11,934	15,580	574	532,181 44
Edmonton, City of, Tel. Dept	Edmonton		1,916,710 52	1,760,731 51	235,006 45	101,942 80	8,836		90	78,762 21
Olds Farmers' Independent Tel. Co	Olds	1,800 00		1,800 00	5 00	5 00		18		
North Western Tel. Co. Ltd	Land Saskatoon	6,500 00		1,200 00	415 00	415 00		8	3	360 00
Ribstone Mutual Tel. Co	Czar			300 00				16		
Rumworth Mutual Tel. Co	Acme	1,152 00		1,440 00	69 00	69 00		23	1	15 00
Shandro Tel. Co. Ltd	Shandro	6,500 00		6,500 00	675 00	300 00		33	2	300 00
Swalwell Tel. Co	Swalwell	1,950 00		2,820 53	164 00	125 77		21	2	111 75
Western General Electric Co. Ltd	Red Deer	90,000 00		23,517 27	11,194 70	9,055 53		260	8	4,331 97
Total		109,013 60	10,818,670 52	10,351,912 38	1,136,312 76	641,694 92	20,770	15,979	680	616,062 37

Table 13.—Statement of Miles of Wire Equipment—Urban and Rural.

Name of Company.	Address.	Urban.					Rural.				
		Galvanized.	Copper Wire.				Galvanized.	Copper Wire.			
		Single Wire.	Single Wire.	Overhead.	Underground.	Submarine.	Single Wire.	Single Wire.	Overhead.	Underground.	Submarine.
Alberta.		Miles.	Miles.	Miles.	Miles.	Miles..	Miles.	Miles.	Miles.	Miles.	Miles.
Crossfield & Samsontown Mutual Tel. Co	Crossfield						15·00				
Government of Alberta Tel. Lines	Edmonton	3,188·00		25,720·00	23,688·00		30,570·00	11,803·00			
Edmonton, City of, Tel. Dept	Edmonton		820·00	15,862·00	34,156·00						
Olds Farmers' Independent Tel. Co	Olds						18·00				
North Western Tel. Co	Land Saskatoon						18·00				
Ribstone Mutual Tel. Co	Czar						30·00				
Rumworth Mutual Tel. Co	Acme	8·00					17·00				
Shandro Tel. Co	Shandro						40·00				
Swalwell Tel. Co	Swalwell						24·00				
Western General Electric Co. Ltd	Red Deer	158·00	12·00	206·00				57·00			
Total		3,354·00	832·00	41,788·00	57,844·00		30,732·00	11,860·00			

TABLE 14.—Statement of Capital, Cost, Revenue, Operating Expenses, Number of Telephones, Employees, etc.

Name of Company.	Address.	Capital Stock.	Funded Debt.	Cost Property and Equipment.	Revenue.	Operating Expenses.	Number of Telephones.		Employees and Remuneration.	
							Central.	Magneto	No.	Amount.
British Columbia.		$ cts.	$ cts.	$ cts.	$ cts.	$ cts.				$ cts.
British Columbia Tel. Co. Ltd.	Vancouver	2,500,000 00	2,433,333 33	5,628,859 55	1,477,076 42	1,167,618 82	37,142	3,783	898	713,072 35
Chilliwack Tel. Co.	Chilliwack	45,650 50		44,338 39	15,448 88	7,252 78		676	9	5,350 35
Creston Power, Light & Tel. Co. Ltd.	Creston	23,000 00		9,108 58	2,076 13	1,003 13		63	3	880 00
Delta Tel. Co.	Ladner	10,400 00		13,678 65	3,686 00	2,200 00		178	3	900 00
Edgewood Tel. Co.	Edgewood	750 00	450 00	1,200 00	156 00	75 00		13	2	75 00
Fort George & Alberta Tel. & Electric Co.	Prince George	40,900 00		50,564 67	17,845 36	12,858 95		175	8	10,106 46
Kootenay Tel. Lines Ltd.	Cranbrook	118,320 00	45,500 00	171,228 26	35,445 74	26,413 97		1,342	17	13,638 55
Mission City Tel. Co.	Mission City	11,560 00		20,378 40	3,507 48	2,851 50		188	6	1,678 20
Okanagan Tel. Co. Ltd.	New Westminster	399,500 00		398,046 43	62,059 61	37,612 99		1,659	30	19,588 32
Prince Rupert Municipal Tel. System.	Prince Rupert	40,000 00	40,000 00	40,000 00	25,902 82	18,687 67	778		11	11,800 15
Quesnel Tel. Co.	Quesnel	10,230 00		10,230 00	1,346 05	1,037 72		63	2	765 00
Revelstoke Trout Lake & Big Bend Tel. Co.	Revelstoke	49,775 59	900 00	41,325 59	8,549 73	3,972 39		301	6	3,138 74
Sorrento Tel. Co.	Notch Hill			900 00	132 00	25 00		13		
Ucluelet Tel. Co.	Ucluelet	1,085 00		1,333 00	162 00	134 65		32	1	65 25
Total		3,251,171 09	2,520,183 33	6,431,191 52	1,653,394 22	1,282,744 57	37,920	7,810	996	781,058 32
Yukon Territory.										
Yukon Tel. Syndicate	Dawson	65,000 00		170,179 78	38,912 27	13,768 12		355	7	11,048 46

Table 15.—Statement of Miles of Wire Equipment—Urban and Rural.

Name of Company.	Address.	Urban.					Rural.				
		Galvanized.	Copper Wire.				Galvanized.	Copper Wire.			
		Single Wire.	Single Wire.	Overhead.	Underground.	Submarine.	Single Wire.	Single Wire.	Overhead.	Underground.	Submarine.
British Columbia.		Miles.	Miles.	Miles.	Miles.	Miles.	Miles.	Miles.	Miles.	Miles.	Miles.
British Columbia Tel. Co. Ltd	Vancouver	6,808·00		67,546·00	38,606·00		1,990·00	40·00	4,688·00		816·00
Chilliwack Tel. Co	Chilliwack	135·00		289·00	11·00		612·00			14·00	
Creston Power, Light & Tel. Co. Ltd	Creston	200·00		2·50		2·50					
Delta Tel. Co	Ladner	14·00					173·00				
Edgewood Tel. Co	Edgewood						18·00				
Fort George & Alberta Tel. & Electric Co	Prince George	200·00	14·00				100·00				
Kootenay Tel. Lines Ltd	Cranbrook	655·00		352·00			490·00	204·00			
Mission City Tel. Co	Mission City						257·00				
Okanagan Tel. Co. Ltd	New Westminster	495·00	5,736 00	11·50		6·25	789·00	281·00			
Prince Rupert Muncipal Tel. System	Prince Rupert	126·00	62·00	514·00							
Quesnel Tel. Co.	Quesnel						30·00				
Revelstoke Trout Lake & Big Bend Tel. Co	Revelstoke						291·00	28·00	136·00	129·00	
Sorrento Tel. Co	Notch Hill						5·50				
Ucluelet Tel. Co	Ucluelet						22·00				
Total		8,627·00	5,812·00	68·715·00	38·617·00	8 75	4,787 50	553·00	4,824·00	143·00	816·00
Yukon Territory.											
Yukon Tel. Syndicate	Dawson	190·50		41·60			319·00	48·00			

TABLE 16.—Statement of Capital, Cost, Revenue, Operating Expenses, Number of Telephones, Employees, etc.

Name of Company.	Address.	Capital Stock.	Funded Debt.	Cost Property and Equipment.	Revenue.	Operating Expenses.	Number of Telephones.		Employees and Remuneration.	
							Central.	Magneto	No.	Amount.
Prince Edward Island.		$ cts.	$ cts.	$ cts.	$ cts.	$ cts.				$ cts.
Augustine Cove & Tyron Tel. Co., Ltd...	Augustine Cove...	473 88		1,127 14	260 35	260 35		28	2	30 00
Bangor R.Tel Co	Bangor	500 00		500 00				6		
Belmont R. Tel. Co	Belmont	1,500 00		1,500 00	49 50	45 71		34	1	9 00
Bear River & St. Margarets Tel. Co	St. Margarets			1,037 14	163 00	163 00		11		
Casecumpec R. Tel. Co	Casecumpec	729 00		702 00	49 05	49 05		18	1	16 00
Darnley R. Tel. Co	Darnley			775 00	25 00	25 00		20	1	25 00
Ellerslie-Conway R. Tel. Co., Ltd	Bideford	2,000 00	1,100 00	1,462 00	33 75	12 85		32	1	7 35
Grand River R. Tel Co	Grand River			1,775 00				32		
Greenwich & Cable Hd. Tel. Co	Cable Head West			487 30				8		
Glenfinnie R. Tel. Co	Glenfinnie			1,166 48	50 00	50 00		34		
Hamilton R. Tel. Co	Hamilton	544 00		900 00	35 00	35 00		22	1	35 00
Kingston R. Tel. Co	Kingston			730 00	5 00	5 00		25		
Linkletter R. Tel Co	Linkletter			428 79	15 00	15 00		8		
Lot 7 Co-op. Tel. Co	Cape Wolf			1,000 00				31		
Lower Tyron R. Tel Co	Victoria	426 43		426 43				14		
Muddy Creek R. Tel. Co., Ltd	Muddy Creek	438 00		438 00	70 25	70 25		5		
Marie Midgell & Milburn Tel. Co	Milburn			535 45				12		
Malpeque R. Tel Co	Malpeque			702 52	21 00	21 00		15	1	21 00
Northam & Arlington R. Tel. Co	Northam	1,000 00		1,145 00				32		
North Shore R. Tel. Co., Ltd	Goose River	625 00		625 00				10		
Newport & Launching Tel. Co	St. Georges			1,500 00	75 00	75 00		7		
O'Leary Brae & W. Point Tel. Co	Coleman			205 70	10 00	10 00		30	1	10 00
Prince Edward Island Tel. Co	Charlottetown	100,000 00	*50,000 00	197,547 40	48,184 71	41,918 48	968	769	8	720,820 72
Sturgeon R. Tel. Co	Sturgeon			175 00	24 00	24 00		3		
Savage Harbour R. Tel. Co	French Village			661 00	20 00	20 00		22		
West River Tel. Co	Canoe Cove	1,150 00		1,130 00	9 85	3 50		9		
York Point R. Tel. Co	York Point			1,650 00				39		
Total		109,396 31	51,100 00	220,332 35	49,100 46	42,803 19	968	1,276	96	20,974 07

*Reported by mistake last year as $100,000 00.

Table 17.—Statement of Miles of Wire Equipment—Urban and Rural.

Name of Company.	Address.	Urban.					Rural.				
		Galvanized	Copper Wire.				Galvanized.	Copper Wire.			
		Single Wire.	Single Wire.	Overhead.	Underground.	Submarine.	Single Wire.	Single Wire.	Overhead.	Underground.	Submarine.
Prince Edward Island.		Miles.	Miles.	Miles.	Miles.	Miles.	Miles.	Miles.	Miles.	Miles.	Miles.
Augustine Cove & Tyron Tel. Co	Augustine Cove						25·00	1·00			
Bangor R. Tel. Co	Bangor						7·00				
Belmont Rural Tel. Co	Belmont						32·00				
Bear River & St. Margarets Tel. Co	St. Margarets						31·00				
Cascumpec R. Tel. Co	Cascumpec						8·75				
Darnley R. Tel. Co	Darnley						7·00				
Ellerslie-Conway R. Tel. Co	Bideford						44·00				
Grand River R. Tel. Co	Grand River						28·00				
Greenwich & Cable Hd. Tel. Co	Cable Head West						17·25				
Glenfinnie R. Tel. Co	Glenfinnie						32·00				
Hamilton R. Tel. Co	Hamilton						17·00				
Kingston R. Tel. Co	Kingston						24·00				
Linkletter R. Tel. Co	Linkletter						8·50				
Lot 7 co.op. Tel. Co	Cape Wolf						25·75				
Lower Tyron R. Tel. Co	Victoria						8·00				
Muddy Creek R. Tel. Co., Ltd	Muddy Creek						6·25				
Marie Midgell & Milburn Tel. Co	Milburn						17·00				
Malpeque R. Tel. Co	Malpeque						10·00				
Northam & Arlington R. Tel. Co	Northam						20·00				
North Shore R. Tel. Co	Goose River						8·00				
Newport & Launching Tel. Co	St. Georges						9·00				
O'Leary Brae & W. Point Tel. Co	Coleman						32·00				
Prince Edward Island Tel. Co	Charlottetown	125·00	20·00	1,415·00	60·00	3·00	580·00	943·00			
Sturgeon R. Tel. Co	Sturgeon						4·00				
Savage Harbour R. Tel. Co	Freneh Village						10·50				
West River R. Tel. Co	Canoe Cove						10·00				
York Point R. Tel. Co	York Point						18·00				
Total		125·00	20·00	1,415·00	60·00	3·00	1,040·00	944·00			

TABLE 18.—Income Account for year ended June 30, 1915.

Name of Telephone Company.	Gross Revenue.	Operating Expenses.	Net Operating Revenue.	Additions.				Total.	Gross Corporate Income.
				Outside Operations.	Rents.	From Securities Held.	Other Income.		
Quebec.	$ cts.	$ cts.	$ cts.	$ cts.	$ cts.	$ cts.	$ cts.	$ cts.	$ cts.
Beauce Tel. Co. Ltd.	15,562 19	13,362 05	2,200 14						2,200 14
Bell Tel. Co., Ltd.	9,294,133 00	7,007,810 00	2,286,323 00			22,409 00	170,466 00	192,875 00	2,479,198 00
Bonaventure and Gaspe Tel. Co., Ltd.	8,843 00	6,029 00	2,814 00						2,814 00
Charlevoix and Saguenay Tel. Co., Ltd.	13,747 01	8,409 53	5,337 48		100 00			100 00	5,437 00
Eastern Townships Tel. Co., Ltd.	39,214 43	34,406 09	4,808 34						4,808 34
Farmers Tel. Co., Ltd.	4,898 00	4,340 00	558 00						558 00
Kamouraska Tel. Co., Ltd.	24,193 02	13,199 12	10,993 90						10,993 90
Megantic Peoples Tel. Co., Ltd.	8,050 00	4,725 00	3,325 00						3,325 00
National Tel. Co., Ltd.	43,460 14	42,823 09	637 05		380 00		1,052 48	1,432 48	2,069 53
Saguenay and Quebec Tel. Co., Ltd.	20,291 56	13,648 51	6,643 05		1,087 78			1,087 78	7,730 83
St. Maurice and Champlain Tel. Co., Ltd.	7,790 00	6,036 40	1,753 60						1,753 60
British Columbia.									
British Columbia Tel. Co., Ltd.	1,477,076 42	1,015,368 88	461,707 54						461,707 54
Chilliwack Tel. Co., Ltd.	14,314 80	5,084 10	9,230 70			1,134 08		1,134 08	10,364 78
Fort George and Alberta Tel. and Electric Co.	17,845 36	13,495 00	4,350 36						4,350 36
Kootenay Tel. Lines, Ltd.	35,445 74	26,413 97	9,031 77						9,031 77
Okanagan Tel. Co., Ltd.	60,686 41	33,535 77	27,150 64		230 00		1,143 20	1,373 20	28,523 84
Nova Scotia.									
Maritime Telegraph and Tel. Co., Ltd.	606,666 01	303,614 49	303,051 52	10,610 07	12,586 26	6,086 25	8,258 35	37,540 93	340,592 45
New Brunswick.									
New Brunswick Tel. Co., Ltd.	448,832 81	239,497 32	209,335 49		6,672 35		4,631 08	11,303 43	220,638 92
Prince Edward Island.									
Prince Edward Island Tel. Co., Ltd.	48,184 71	40,272 75	7,911 96				2,707 85	2,707 85	10,619 81

TABLE 18—Income Account for year ended June 30, 1915—*Continued.*

Alberta.									
Edmonton, City of, Tel. Dept	235,006 45	101,942 80	133,063 65	4,170 48	2,331 60		5,594 05	12,096 13	145,159 78
Western General Electric Co., Ltd	11,194 70	9,005 65	2,189 05						2,189 05
Ontario.									
Ahmic Tel. Co., Ltd	1,002 58	510 00	492 58						492 58
Betherda and Stouffville Tel. Co., Ltd	9,828 05	5,517 05	4,311 00				8,492 80	8,492 80	12,803 80
Beeton Tel. Co.) Ltd	7,619 00	4,833 00	2,786 00						2,786 00
Blenheim and South Kent Tel. Co., Ltd	8,122 75	4,161 66	3,961 09						3,961 09
Cochrane Tel. Co., Ltd	3,305 03	2,261 61	1,043 42				4 00	4 00	1,047 42
Consolidated Tel. Co., Ltd	9,492 12	8,486 51	1,005 61	1,800 00	5,134 20	50 50	2,507 42	9,492 12	10,497 73
Dunville Tel. Co., Ltd	15,865 20	9,033 20	6,832 00				3,202 88	3,202 88	10,034 88
Erie Tel. Co., Ltd	14,999 83	8,730 40	6,269 43	2,500 00	94 75			2,594 75	8,864 18
Fort William, Corporation of, Tel. Dept	64,210 70	32,995 33	31,215 37						31,215 37
Goderich Rural Tel. Co., Ltd	6,955 43	2,200 00	4,755 43						4,755 43
Ingersoll Tel. Co., Ltd	18,395 46	9,450 44	8,945 02		100 00			100 00	9,045 02
Moore Municipal Tel. Co	6,291 84	5,522 85	768 99	2,033 11	2,250 45		4,203 45	8,487 01	9,256 00
Metcalfe Rural Tel. Co., Ltd	4,000 00	1,675 00	2,325 00		60 00			60 00	2,385 00
McKillop, Logan and Herbert Tel. Co., Ltd	5,421 29	2,794 51	2,626 78						2,626 78
Norfolk County Tel. Co., Ltd	25,778 77	16,410 51	9,368 26						9,368 26
Port Arthur Municipal Tel. Dept	49,461 01	26,920 37	22,540 64						22,540 64
Porcupine Tel. Co	9,878 28	7,032 28	2,846 00				34 95	34 95	2,880 95
Temiskaming Tel. Co., Ltd	39,733 22	22,678 71	17,054 51						17,054 51
Welland County Tel. Co., Ltd	13,766 66	7,034 08	6,732 58		376 89			376 89	7,109 47
Total	12,749,562 98	9,121,267 03	3,628,295 95	21,113 66	31,404 28	29,679 83	212,298 51	294,496 28	3,922,792 23

TABLE 18—Income Account for year

Name of Telephone Company.	Deductions.			
	Taxes.	Interest on Bonds.	Other Deductions.	Total Deductions.
	$ cts.	$ cts.	$ cts.	$ cts.
Quebec.				
Beauce Tel. Co., Ltd	192 35	337 75	331 07	861 17
Bell Tel. Co., Ltd	240,835 00	557,450 00		798,303 00
Bonaventure and Gaspé Tel. Co., Ltd		1,050 00		1,050 00
Charlevoix and Saguenay Tel. Co., Ltd	300 00	2,306 59		2,606 59
Eastern Townships Tel. Co., Ltd	901 09	6,522 00	2,673 28	10,096 37
Farmers Tel. Co., Ltd	23 00	854 00		877 00
Kamouraska Tel. Co., Ltd		4,607 66		4,607 66
Megantic Peoples Tel. Co., Ltd	30 50	450 00		480 00
National Tel. Co., Ltd	999 96			999 96
Saguenay and Quebec Tel. Co., Ltd	152 99	9,000 00	200 23	9,352 22
St. Maurice and Champlain Tel. Co., Ltd				
British Columbia.				
British Columbia Tel. Co., Ltd		107,249 94	45,000 00	152,249 94
Chilliwack Tel. Co., Ltd	124 47		1,944 21	2,068 68
Fort George and Alberta Tel. and Electric Co				3,25 84
Kootenay Tel. Lines, Ltd	1,362 00	3,387 64		4,749 64
Okanagan Tel. Co., Ltd	807 59		3,269 63	4,077 22
Nova Scotia.				
Maritime Telegraph and Tel. Co., Ltd	11,281 87	78,021 46	3,233 98	92,537 31
New Brunswick.				
New Brunswick Tel. Co., Ltd	14,987 70	5,000 00		19,987 70
Prince Edward Island.				
Prince Edward Island Tel. Co., Ltd	345 73	1,300 00		1,645 73
Alberta.				
Edmonton, City of, Tel. Dept		90,656 52	847 53	91,504 05
Western General Electric Co., Ltd	49 88			49 88
Ontario.				
Ahmic Tel. Co., Ltd	122 00	168 00		290 00
Bethesda and Stouffville Tel. Co., Ltd	75 71	1,008 00	8,065 11	9,148 82
Beeton Tel. Co., Ltd	182 00			182 00
Blenheim and South Kent Tel. Co., Ltd	134 54		824 57	959 11
Cochrane Tel. Co., Ltd	29 31			29 31
Consolidated Tel. Co., Ltd	80 64	216 00	9,195 48	9,492 12
Dunville Tel. Co., Ltd	131 13	1,404 00	639 50	2,174 63
Erie Tel. Co., Ltd	213 95		773 34	987 29
Fort William, Corporation of, Tel. Dept		34,428 86		34,428 86
Goderich Rural Tel. Co., Ltd	51 10		2,693 90	2,745 00
Ingersoll Tel. Co., Ltd	209 27	2,100 00	963 30	3,272 57
Moore Municipal Tel. Co	209 13	2,260 58	7,456 00	9,925 71
Metcalfe Rural Tel. Co., Ltd			84 00	84 00
McKillop, Logan and Herbert Tel. Co., Ltd	16 76		1,248 58	1,265 34
Norfolk County Tel. Co., Ltd	172 15	750 00		922 15
Port Arthur Municipal Tel. Dept		19,088 54	1,100 00	20,188 54
Porcupine Tel. Co	56 27		254 75	311 02
Temiskaming Tel. Co. Ltd	769 80	450 00	6,098 77	7,318 57
Welland County Tel. Co., Ltd	189 72	680 00	169 55	1,039 47
Total	275,055 61	930,747 54	100,325 82	1,306,128 97

ended June 30, 1915—*Concluded.*

Net Corporate Income.		Disposition of Net Income.					Balance to Profit and Loss.	
Income.	Loss.	Dividends.		Sinking Fund.	Reserve.	Total.	Cr.	Dr.
		Common Stock.	Preferred Stock.					
$ cts.	$ cts.	$ cts.	$ cts.	$ cts.	$ cts.	$ cts.	$ cts.	$ cts.
1,338 79		1,500 00				1,500 00		
1,680,895 00		1,440,000 00				1,440,000 00	240,895 00	
1,764 00							1,764 00	
2,830 89					2,000 00	2,000 00	830 89	
	5,288 03							5,288 03
	319 00							319 00
6,386 24					6,386 24	6,386 24		
2,844 50		875 00				875 00	1,969 50	
1,069 57							1,069 57	
	1,622 39							1,622 39
1,753 60							1,753 60	
309,457 60		129,000 00	60,000 00		125,000 00	305,000 00	4,457 60	
8,296 10		3,650 44		4,000 00		7,650 44	645 66	
1,091 52							1,091 52	
4,282 13							4,282 13	
24,446 62		22,519 33			606 01	23,125 34	1,321 28	
248,055 14		51,000 00	59,999 86	146,126 31		257,126 17		9,071 03
200,651 22		88,167 80		97,190 91		185,358 71	15,292 51	
8,974 08		6,000 00				6,000 00	2,974 08	
53,655 73				52,536 26	39,004 11	91,540 37		37,884 64
2,139 17					2,139 17	2,139 17		
202 58				200 00		200 00	2 58	
3,654 98		1,931 25			1,233 25	3,164 50	490 48	
2,604 00		1,600 00				1,600 00	1,004 00	
3,001 98		1,502 08			1,499 90	3,001 98		
1,018 11		750 00				750 00	268 11	
1,005 61							1,005 61	
7,860 25		1,800 00	1,798 00			3,598 00	4,262 25	
7,876 89		1,141 95			2,500 00	3,641 95	4,234 94	
	3,213 49							3,213 49
2,010 43		279 75		1,395 67		1,675 42	335 01	
5,772 45		3,258 00		2,082 30	432 15	5,772 45		
	669 71							669 71
2,301 00		1,590 00				1,590 00	711 00	
1,361 44							1,361 44	
8,446 11		2,598 00			3,500 00	6,098 00	2,348 11	
2,352 10				5,842 37		5,842 37		3,490 23
2,569 93		2,100 00				2,100 00	469 93	
9,735 94		4,009 92				4,009 92	5,726 02	
6,070 00		2,884 50		3,019 13		5,903 63	166 37	
2,627,775 88	11,112 62	1,759,158 02	121,797 86	312,392 95	184,300 83	2,377,649 66	300,733 19	61,719 59

TABLE 19.—Statement of Provinces of Capital, Cost, Revenue, Operating Expenses, Number of Telephones, Employees, etc.

Province.	Capital Stock.	Funded Debt.	Cost of Property and Equipment.	Revenue.	Operating Expenses.	Number of Telephones.		Employees and Remuneration.	
						Central.	Magneto.	Number.	Amount.
	$ cts.	$ cts.	$ cts.	$ cts.	$ cts.				$ cts.
Nova Scotia	1,924,504 37	1,502,714 00	3,362,778 72	674,464 69	419,951 16	13,238	7,987	769	294,001 17
New Brunswick	1,339,128 91	119,749 00	1,823,367 43	478,887 08	265,157 75	9,714	7,803	451	161,460 57
Prince Edward Island	109,396 31	51,100 00	220,332 35	49,100 46	42,803 19	968	1,276	96	20,974 07
Quebec	19,375,960 69	11,704,041 35	38,590 730 66	9,824,437 02	7,495,118 28	62,948	29,544	3,723	1,924,682 23
Ontario	1,864,375 61	1,834,317 71	5,197,066 52	978,206 05	637,287 96	128,280	111,327	6,620	3,272,428 66
Manitoba	27,596 54	10,723,397 96	10,758,230 08	1,850,997 49	1,422,067 20	29,481	17,798	1,174	832,315 82
Saskatchewan	880,975 00	6,063,695 62	6,886,793 62	916,960 82	616,127 52	9,906	19,986	556	442,997 60
Alberta	109,013 60	10,818,670 52	10,351,912 38	1,136,312 76	641,694 92	20,770	15,979	680	616,062 37
British Columbia	3,251,171 09	2,520,183 33	6,431,191 52	1,653,394 22	1,282,741 57	37,920	7,810	996	781,058 32
Yukon	65,000 00	.....	170,179 78	38,912 27	13,768 12	.....	355	.....	11,048 46
Totals	28,947,122 02	45,337,869 49	83,792,583 06	17,601,672 86	12,836,715 67	313,225	219,865	15,072	8,357,029 27

TABLE 20.—Statement by Provinces of Miles of Wire Equipment—Urban and Rural.

Province.	URBAN.					RURAL.				
	Galvanized.	Copper Wire.				Galvanized.	Copper Wire.			
	Single Wire.	Single Wire.	Overhead.	Underground.	Submarine.	Single Wire.	Single Wire.	Overhead.	Underground.	Submarine.
	Miles.	Miles.	Miles.	Miles.	Miles.	Miles.	Miles.	Miles.	Miles.	Miles.
Nova Scotia	1,363·00	2,106·00	10,812·00	10,849·00	84·00	10,608·75	4,472·50	275·00	.....	41·00
New Brunswick	6,234·02	651·03	5,999·41	5,518·91	44·80	5,596·22	3,775·58	.....	.....	32·00
Prince Edward Island	125·00	20·00	1,415·00	60·00	3·00	1,040·00	944·00	.....	.....	.....
Quebec	3,965·00	477·00	38,965·00	139,023·00	295·50	65,949·55	2,122·25	1,433·00	5·25	7·50
Ontario	3,341·00	11,102·98	123,030·92	257,608·62	551·75	174,588·95	1,314·00	1,945·83	1·25	16·90
Manitoba	30·50	.....	35,198·00	73,112·00	.....	48,643·00	13,627·00	43·00	.....	.....
Saskatchewan	1,000·00	.....	32,750·00	17,580·00	.....	31,128·00	21,250·00	.....	.....	.....
Alberta	3,354·00	832·00	41,788·00	57,844·00	.....	30,732·00	11,860·00	.....	.....	.....
British Columbia	8,627·00	5,812·00	68,715·00	38,617·00	8·75	4,787·50	553·00	4,824·00	143·00	816·00
Yukon	190·50	.....	41·60	.....	.....	319·00	48·00	.....	.....	.....
Totals	28,230·52	21,001·01	358,714·92	600,212·53	987·80	373,392·97	60,236·33	8,520·83	149·50	913·40

INDEX.

	PAGE.
Introduction	7
Comparative Summary	13
Ontario—Table 1—Statement of Capital, Cost, Number of Telephones, etc	14
Ontario—Table 2—Statement of Wire Mileage	27
Quebec—Table 3—Statement of Capital, Cost, Number of Telephones, etc	40
Quebec—Table 4—Statement of Wire Mileage	44
Saskatchewan—Table 5—Statement of Capital, Cost, Number of Telephones, Wire Mileage, etc	48
Nova Scotia—Table 6—Statement of Capital, Cost, Number of Telephones, etc	61
Nova Scotia—Table 7—Statement of Wire Mileage	64
New Brunswick—Table 8—Statement of Capital, Cost, Number of Telephones, etc	68
New Brunswick—Table 9—Statement of Wire Mileage	69
Manitoba—Table 10—Statement of Capital, Cost, Number of Telephones, etc	70
Manitoba—Table 11—Statement of Wire Mileage	71
Alberta—Table 12—Statement of Capital, Cost, Number of Telephones, etc	72
Alberta—Table 13—Statement of Wire Mileage	73
British Columbia—Table 14—Statement of Capital, Cost, Number of Telephones, etc	74
British Columbia—Table 15—Statement of Wire Mileage	75
Prince Edward Island—Table 16—Statement of Capital, Cost, Number of Telephones, etc	76
Prince Edward Island—Table 17—Statement of Wire Mileage	77
Table 18—Income Account	78
Table 19—Statement, by Provinces, of Capital, Cost, Revenue, Number of Telephones, etc	82
Table 20—Statement, by Provinces, of Wire Equipment—Urban and Rural	83

EXPRESS STATISTICS

OF THE

DOMINION OF CANADA

FOR THE

YEAR ENDED JUNE 30

1915

PRINTED BY ORDER OF PARLIAMENT

OTTAWA
PRINTED BY J. DE L. TACHÉ, PRINTER TO THE KING'S MOST EXCELLENT MAJESTY
1916

[No. 20E—1916.]

To Field Marshal, His Royal Highness Prince Arthur William Patrick Albert, Duke of Connaught and of Strathearn, K.G., K.T., K.P., etc., etc., etc., Governor General and Commander in Chief of the Dominion of Canada.

May it Please Your Royal Highness,—

The undersigned has the honour to present to your Royal Highness, Express Statistics for the year ended June 30, 1915.

F. COCHRANE,
Minister of Railways and Canals.

To the Honourable F. COCHRANE,
Minister of Railways and Canals.

SIR,—I have the honour to submit the report of the Comptroller of Statistics in relation to the operations of Express Companies in the Dominion of Canada for the year ended June 30, 1915.

I have the honour to be, sir,
Your obedient servant,

A. W. CAMPBELL,
Deputy Minister of Railways and Canals.

OFFICE OF THE COMPTROLLER OF STATISTICS.
OTTAWA, Feb. 7, 1916.

A. W. CAMPBELL, ESQ., C.E.,
Deputy Minister of Railways and Canals.

SIR,—I have the honour to submit herewith Express Statistics for the year ended June 30, 1915.

The number of reporting units was reduced this year by the retirement from business of the United States Express Company.

Reports were received from the following express corporations operating in Canada:—

The American Express Company.
The British America Express Company.
The Canadian Express Company.
The Canadian Northern Express Company.
The Dominion Express Company.
The Great Northern Express Company.
The National Express Company.
Wells Fargo and Company.

It should be understood, however, that the report of the American Express Company also includes the operations of the National Express Company.

ORGANIZATION.

The following are the facts with respect to the organization of express companies operating in Canada:—

AMERICAN EXPRESS COMPANY.—President, George C. Taylor; First Vice-President, Francis F. Flagg; Vice-President in charge of Financial Department, Howard K. Brooks; Vice-President in charge of Traffic, Dixon S. Elliott; Secretary, Frederick P. Small; Treasurer, James F. Fargo; Comptroller, Robert Mundle; General Manager of Eastern Lines, Robert E. M. Cowie; General Manager of Western Lines, J. A. D. Vickers; General Manager of Foreign Department, including Canada, Harry Gee; General Manager of European Department, William S. Dalliba; Manager of Equipment and Supplies, Elisha Flagg; Traffic Manager, Edwin E. Bush; Directors, George C. Taylor, Francis F. Flagg, Charles M. Pratt, John H. Bradley, Cornelius Vanderbilt, J. Horace Harding, John G. Milburn and James S. Alexander. Headquarters, 65 Broadway, New York.

BRITISH AMERICA EXPRESS COMPANY.—President, T. J. Kennedy; Vice-Presidents, J. F. Taylor, W. C. Franz and Herbert Coppell; Secretary, A. Taylor; Treasurer, R. Barber; Comptroller, I. L. Godfrey; General Manager, T. J. Kennedy; Directors, T. J. Kennedy, J. F. Taylor, H. Coppell, W. C. Franz, W. K. Whigham, T. Gibson and James Hawson. Headquarters, Sault Ste. Maries, Ont.

CANADIAN EXPRESS COMPANY.—Chairman of the Board, E. J. Chamberlin; President, John Pullen; Directors, E. J. Chamberlin, John Pullen, Frank Scott, Hugh Paton, Frank Scott, W. H. Biggar, J. E. Dalrymple and H. G. Kelley; Secretary-Treasurer, Frank Scott; General Solicitor, W. H. Biggar; General Auditor, W. W. Williamson. The Headquarters of the Company are at Montreal

Canadian Northern Express Company.—President, Sir William Mackenzie; Vice-Presidents, Sir Donald Mann and D. B. Hanna; Directors, Sir William Mackenzie, Sir Donald Mann, R. J. Mackenzie and Z. A. Lash, K.C.; Secretary, R. P. Ormsby; Treasurer, L. W. Mitchell; General Auditor, J. D. Morton; General Superintendent, W. C. Muir; Superintendents, C. A. Cunningham and F. N. Wiggins. Headquarters, Toronto.

Dominion Express Company.—President and General Manager, Walter S. Stout; Vice-President, R. Paton McLeod; Directors, W. S. Stout, R. Paton McLeod, Sir Thomas G. Shaughnessy, K.C.V.O., C. R. Hosmer and R. B. Angus; Secretary, H. C. Oswald; Treasurer, G. A. Newman; General Auditor, W. H. Plant; Superintendent of Eastern Lines, W. Walsh; Superintendent of Western Lines, G. Ford; Freight Manager, V. G. R. Vickers; Traffic Manager, W. H. Burr. Headquarters, Toronto.

Great Northern Express Company.—President, W. P. Kenney; Vice-President, Ronald Stewart; Directors, L. W. Hill, J. M. Gruber, W. P. Kenney, G. R. Martin, and Ronald Stewart; Secretary-Treasurer, L. E. Katzenbach; Comptroller, G. R. Martin; General Manager, Ronald Stewart; Auditor, G. A. Yates. Headquarters, St. Paul, Minnesota.

National Express Company.—President, Francis F. Flagg; Vice-Presidents, George C. Taylor and Dixon S. Elliott; Secretary, Frederick P. Small; Treasurer, James F. Fargo; Directors, George C. Taylor, Francis F. Flagg, James F. Fargo, Emery H. Smith and Dixon S. Elliott. The administrative officers are the administrative officers of the American Express Company, and the headquarters are at 65 Broadway, New York.

Wells Fargo and Company.—President, B. D. Caldwell; Vice-Presidents A. Christeson and E. A. Stedman; Directors, B. D. Caldwell, F. D. Underwood, C. A. Peabody, H. W. de Forest, R. Delafield, J. H. Schiff, W. V. S. Thorne, W. A. Harriman, L. F. Loree, H. E. Huntingdon, E. A. Stedman, A. Christeson and W. F. Herrin; Comptroller, J. W. Newlean; Secretary, C. H. Gardiner; Treasurer, B. H. River; General Managers, A. Christeson and E. A. Stedman; Traffic Manager, G. S. Lee. Headquarters, Chicago.

OPERATING MILEAGE.

Operating mileage in Canada for 1915 was returned at 38,610·89, as against 36,648·49 for 1914.

There were also 16,811 miles reported as attaching to operations carried on outside of Canada, principally on ocean vessels.

Following was the division of operating mileage in Canada for 1915 and the four preceding years:—

——	1911.	1912.	1913.	1914.	1915.
Over steam roads	25,377·90	26,855·30	29,476·62	33,551·13	35,572·73
" electric lines	213·81	278·61	212·61	212·61	254·41
" steamboat lines	1,792·00	3,161·50	2,743·50	2,770·00	2,706·00
" stage lines	146·00	146·91	122·00	112·00	75·00
Miscellaneous	55·75	3·25	2·75	2·75	2·75
	27,585·46	30,445·57	32,557·48	36,648·49	38,610·89

Operating mileage in 1915 and the four years preceding was distributed among the provinces as follows:—

—	1911.	1912.	1913.	1914.	1915.
New Brunswick	1,119·42	1,378·41	2,103·28	2,086·08	2,043·86
Nova Scotia	1,396·32	1,339·13	1,464·19	1,483·19	1,438·98
Prince Edward Island	298·10	213·10	558·90	483·80	568·80
Quebec	3,914·64	3,914·69	4,686·68	4,623·28	4,655·93
Ontario	9,938·20	10,245·97	10,333·56	11,080·05	10,519·90
Manitoba	3,339·04	3,608·15	3,598·71	3,936·51	4,161·01
Saskatchewan	3,034·43	3,698·20	4,174·36	5,397·26	5,845·96
Alberta	1,371·08	1,750·04	1,879·50	2,807·00	3,405·80
British Columbia	2,814·02	3,395·68	2,941·10	3,477·10	4,866·43
Yukon	59·48	601·48	692·70	692·70	692·70
Foreign	300·72	300·72	124·50	381·52	411·52
Total	27,585·46	30,445·57	32,557·48	36,648·49	38,610·89

Operating mileage in 1915 and the four preceding years was distributed among the various reporting units as follows:—

	1911.	1912.	1913.	1914.	1915.
American Express Company	1,252·43	1,290·43	1,175·09	1,127·99	1,290·29
British America Express Company			89·00	368·50	414·04
Canadian Express Company	7,231·30	7,406·31	6,926·51	9,419·51	10,249·13
Canadian Northern Express Company	4,422·29	5,255·49	5,762·25	6,343·21	6,589·25
Dominion Express Company	13,709·33	14,604·88	16,765·73	17,168·77	18,421·43
Great Northern Express Company	575·40	661·86	672·76	672·76	710·39
United States Express Company	224·84	224·84	224·84	224·84	
Wells Fargo and Company	90·70	921·60	941·30	941·30	936·36
National Express Company	80·16	80·16			
Total	27,585·46	30,445·57	32,557·48	36,266·97	38,610·89

CAPITALIZATION AND COST.

Under this head account is taken only of Canadian corporations. It would be confusing to include large figures relating to foreign organizations, the operations of which in Canada constitute only a fraction of their total business.

The total capitalization on June 30, 1915, was $4,882,200, of which all but $40,000 consisted of common stock. This stock account was distributed among Canadian companies as follows:—

British America Express Company	$ 100,000
Canadian Express Company	1,742,200
Canadian Northern Express Company	1,000,000
Dominion Express Company	2,000,000
Total	$ 4,842,200

There has not been any change in the foregoing account for a period of years. The situation, in so far as the capitalization of Canadian companies is concerned, has been explained in previous reports. These express organizations

are without exception owned and operated by railway companies. The stocks are held wholly by the latter. The profits go to the holders. The express business, although carried on under another corporate name, is essentially a part of the operations of the railway company in each case. The common stock appears not to have been turned into money for the purchase of property, either for the purposes of operation or anything else. Whatever cash was produced by the sale of stock was used in the financial business of the companies, to the extent that it was used at all. Real property and equipment was practically paid for out of earnings.

The cost of real property down to June 30, 1915, was reported at $3,267,887.59—an increment of $94,405.99 as compared with 1914. This account was made up as follows:—

Real estate used in operation		$ 760,200 00
Buildings, etc., used in operation		1,508,123 78
Equipment—		
Horses	$ 203,226 25	
Vehicles	290,946 32	
Other equipment	505,391 24	999,563 81
Total		$ 3,267,887 59

Table No. 3 will show the foregoing account in detail.

EARNINGS AND OPERATING EXPENSES.

As shown in detail in table 4, gross earnings in 1915 were $11,311,797.20, as against $12,646,451.99 in 1914.

The amounts of gross earnings from the prescribed sources in 1915 and two preceding years were as follows:—

	1913.	1914.	1915.
	$ cts	$ cts	$ cts
Express revenue	12,400,034 52	12,170,710 37	10,902,966 52
Miscellaneous	34,286 69	39,350 10	14,652 04
Financial paper	319,215 08	352,440 46	317,780 62
Other earnings	73,942 67	83,751 06	76,398 02
Total	12,827,478 96	12,646,451 99	11,311,797 20

Revenue from transportation is the sum of the first two items. Express companies have urged that against this revenue should be shown the operating expenses properly assignable to transportation. They argued that such a statement would show clearly the relatively shall amount of net earnings realized from the ordinary business of carrying. While it is obvious that a separation of operating cost, as between transportation and the selling of financial paper, could only be done on an arbitrary basis, rather than as a matter of actual accounting, there was every disposition to meet this request; but only two of the Canadian companies took advantage of the privilege accorded. Nothing could therefore be done in the matter.

For purposes of comparison, following are the facts with respect to revenue from sources other than transportation in 1915 and the three preceding years:—

	1912.	1913.	1914.	1915.
	$ cts	$ cts	$ cts	$ cts
Money orders—domestic	201,534 88	173,260 98	207,605 23	186,579 59
Money orders—foreign	18,056 02	21,137 18	20,649 71	15,239 20
Travellers' cheques—domestic	2,806 60	23,145 22	190 50	3,429 68
Travellers' cheques—foreign	2,714 92	2,892 04	9,203 27	1,704 18
C.O.D. cheques	83,791 24	98,779 65	114,791 75	110,828 57
Other earnings	68,138 64	73,942 67	83,751 06	76,398 02
Total	377,042 30	393,157 75	436,191 52	394,178 64

Operating expenses amounted in 1915 to $5,632,904.16, as against $6,246,632.28 in 1914.

Express privileges, represented by the amount paid by express companies to railways and other carriers for the movement of express traffic, had a total of $5,610,224.11, as compared with $6,016,364.07 for the preceding year.

Combining operating expenses and express privileges, which aggregated $11,243,128.27, and deducting this sum from gross receipts, there was a net balance of $68,668.93. In 1914 the balance was $383,455.64; in 1913 it was $759,614.32.

This large loss of net corporate revenue to express companies in Canada during a relatively short period will be better understood when the main factors of the account are set down in juxtaposition, as follows:—

	Gross Receipts.	Operating Expenses.	Express Privileges.	Net Operating Revenue.
	$ cts	$ cts	$ cts.	$ cts
1911	9,913,018 31	4,151,227 91	4,553,861 45	1,207,928 97
1912	10,994,418 10	4,880,120 00	4,892,242 49	1,222,055 61
1913	12,827,478 96	5,743,544 73	6,324,319 91	759,614 32
1914	12,646,451 99	6,246,652 28	6,016,364 07	383,455 64
1915	11,311,797 20	5,632,904 16	5,610,224 11	68,668 93

An analysis of the foregoing figures reveals the principal cause of the rapid decline in net operating revenue. Gross receipts increased materially during the five year period under review; but controllable expenditure also increased. For example, while gross receipts increased by 16·6 per cent in 1913, operating expenses and express privileges combined increased by 23·5 per cent. On the other hand, when gross receipts in 1914 declined by 1·5 per cent, operating expenses and express privileges advanced by 1·7 per cent. In 1915 gross receipts fell off by 10·6 per cent; operating expenses and express privileges by 8·4 per cent.

The following table shows the rising ratio of operating cost and express privileges in their relationship to gross receipts since 1911:—

	Operating Expenses.	Express Privileges.	Tot
	Per cent.	Per cent.	Per cent.
1911	41·9	45·9	87·8
1912	44·4	44·5	88·9
1913	44·8	49·4	94·2
1914	49·6	47·0	96·6
1915	49·8	49 6	99·4

The reports of the various companies throw no light whatever on the reasons which led to the advances indicated in the above table. A comparative study of items of operating expenses will show, however, in what divisions of the express service there were increases during the past five years. The advances in cost of express privileges constitute largely a domestic matter, since these are for the most part the charges which the owning railways make to their express companies for the hauling of express cars.

Express privileges, which involve the right to operate over railway lines and other avenues of transportation, cost $6,610,224.11 in 1915. The cost was $6,246,632.28 in 1914. Thus, while gross receipts decreased by 10·6 per cent in 1915, the ratio of express privileges to gross receipts increased by 2·6 per cent.

It should be explained that the effort made during the past year to have express companies report the weight of express matter handled, as well as the number of packages, was not successful. Some of the companies declared themselves unable to comply with such a requirement.

Following was the distribution of operating expenses in 1915 and four years preceding years:—

	1911.	1912.	1913.	1914.	1915.
	$ cts	$ cts.	$ cts	$ cts.	$ cts.
Maintenance	33,721 75	214,489 59	146,268 89	144,881 75	107,617 57
Traffic expenses	104,307 20	94,186 61	160,203 25	182,163 77	90,692 67
Transportation expenses	3,871,901 69	4,075,515 28	4,918,556 48	5,399,601 67	4,981,846 41
General expenses	141,297 27	495,928 52	518,516 11	519,985 09	452,747 51
Total	4,151,227 91	4,880,120 00	5,743,544 73	6,246,632 28	5,632,904 16

It will be observed that the principal increase each year during the period to which the foregoing figures relate was in transportation expenses. In 1914, with less express matter moved, it cost $481,045.19 more than in 1913 to move it. In 1915, however, transportation expenses were reduced by $417,755.26. This reduction was equal to 7·7 per cent, while gross receipts, as has been indicated, declined by 10·6 per cent. In other words, express companies did not adjust operating cost to earnings.

For purposes of analytical comparison the following details for the years 1912, 1913, 1914 and 1915 are given of operating cost under each of the following divisional heads:—

MAINTENANCE.

	1912.	1913.	1914.	1915.
	$ cts.	$ cts.	$ cts.	$ cts.
Superintendence	9,392 13	4,412 79	4,498 08	4,225 36
Buildings, fixtures and grounds	121,287 00	9,658 41	5,015 30	3,747 35
Office equipment	11,836 77	21,232 94	18,973 90	13,744 70
Horses	11,636 62	17,775 45	19,271 59	19,756 91
Vehicles—repairs	45,020 44	61,143 50	75,550 91	48,799 10
Vehicles—renewals	2,880 75	17,307 27	7,174 75	5,555 02
Stable equipment	9,416 48	12,088 20	10,829 54	7,996 29
Transportation equipment	2,516 76	2,336 11	3,525 13	1,522 75
Other expenses	174 58	8 44	7 32	2,270 09
Undistributed	328 06	295 83	35 23	...
Joint facilities Dr	...	9 95	...	...
Total	214,489 59	146,268 89	144,881 75	107,617 57

TRAFFIC EXPENSES.

	1912.	1913.	1914.	1915.
	$ cts.	$ cts.	$ cts.	$ cts.
Superintendence	51,809 37	60,579 99	48,178 00	41,693 03
Outside agencies	6,948 20	8,255 65	7,733 22	669 04
Advertising	12,805 80	16,615 26	13,170 01	5,872 66
Traffic associations	6,170 72	4,359 45	10,644 65	5,870 47
Stationery and printing	16,159 89	70,232 67	102,437 80	33,567 74
Other expenses	131 67	12 05	0 09	3,019 73
Undistributed	160 96	148 18	...	...
Total	94,186 61	160,203 25	182,163 77	90,692 67

TRANSPORTATION EXPENSES.

	1912.	1913	1914.	1915.
	$ cts.	$ cts.	$ cts.	$ cts.
Superintendence	174,208 91	239,643 37	304,919 72	269,157 68
Office employees	960,871 05	1,243,743 76	1,325,727 46	1,240,119 91
Commissions	720,315 68	804,193 85	839,645 00	774,494 84
Wagon employees	458,835 65	565,328 74	622,214 06	594,654 81
Office supplies and expenses	111,691 01	151,025 66	190,021 79	153,961 15
Rent of local offices	467,264 18	492,101 92	581,032 60	587,229 86
Stable employees	43,356 78	55,412 35	54,213 51	59,960 97
Stable supplies and expenses	340,959 37	407,762 46	422,041 13	397,774 14
Train employees	454,508 84	529,874 40	571,757 71	545,009 43
Train supplies and expenses	4,179 58	6,523 45	6,463 67	6,094 20
Transfer employees	46,962 88	83,719 22	90,093 82	24,049 84
Transfer expenses	41,378 26	16,727 73	15,292 23	11,072 51
Stationery and printing	113,857 81	165,370 37	178,646 35	132,887 83
Loss and damage—freight	107,297 41	156,631 84	193,547 17	130,070 92
Loss and damage—money	15,976 32	7,252 40	4,237 97	9,763 65
Damage to property	631 98	1,187 56	1,206 09	1,223 25
Injuries to persons	5,752 91	3,557 02	5,909 30	14,183 06
Other expenses	4,052 04	4,634 03	6,297 22	32,909 49
Undistributed	3,414 62	3,425 26	...	...
Joint facilities, Cr	...	−19,558 91	−13,665 13	2,771 13
Total	4,075,505 28	4,918,556 48	5,399,601 67	4,981,846 41

GENERAL EXPENSES.

	1912.	1913.	1914.	1915.
	$ cts.	$ cts.	$ cts.	$ cts.
Salaries and expenses of general officers	66,010 00	63,507 40	68,013 69	78,454 23
Salaries and expenses of clerks, etc	264,687 18	284,993 26	306,194 80	225,384 80
General office supplies and expenses	37,885 63	39,875 74	24,624 82	25,115 83
Law expenses	9,376 61	3,859 74	7,081 90	4,832 52
Insurance	28,563 18	11,465 93	24,635 02	20,718 49
Pensions	48,085 59	56,412 47	65,104 02	38,348 80
Stationery and printing	21,116 54	21,441 14	7,573 45	6,482 03
Other expenses	19,677 63	36,495 50	16,757 34	53,410 81
Undistributed	526 16	464 93		
Total	495,928 52	518,516 11	519,985 09	452,747 51

INCOME ACCOUNT.

The results of the year's operation are fairly presented in the following statement of income account:—

Gross receipts from operation		$ 11,311,797 20
Express privileges	$ 5,610,224 11	
Operating expenses	5,632,904 16	
		11,243,128 27
Net operating revenue		$68,668 93
Net outside operations		26,955 46
Total net revenue		$ 95,624 39
Less taxes		123,029 27
Operating deficit		$ 27,404 88
Addition—other income		104,636 69
Gross corporate income		$ 77,231 81

There were no dividends declared in 1915, nor were any deductions reported from the foregoing gross corporate income. It stands therefore as the net corporate income as well. Four years ago express companies operating in Canada had a credit balance, after making deductions for dividends, etc., of $683,664.33.

SALARIES AND WAGES.

Combining the items of salaries, wages and commissions, as shown in operating expenses for 1915, a total of $3,857,204.90 is given, as compared with $4,235,455.85 for the year preceding.

The foregoing total for 1915 was equal to 68·5 per cent of operating expenses. The ratio in 1914 was 67·8.

The statistical system in force does not require express companies to report the number of employees.

FINANCIAL PAPER.

Financial paper was issued by express companies during the year 1915 for $54,289,736.17, or $11,607,603.37 less than in 1914. The number of money orders, travellers' cheques, etc., handled was 4,218,124. The record with respect to financial paper issued in 1915 and preceding years is as follows:—

Financial Paper.	1911.	1912.	1913.	1914.	1915.
	Amount.	Amount.	Amount.	Amount.	Amount.
	$ cts.	$ cts.	$ cts.	$ cts.	$ cts.
Money orders—domestic	43,361,803 54	45,620,681 99	49,773,324 10	49,670,865 30	42,516,429 46
" —foreign	2,205,980 16	2,698,796 91	3,510,668 14	3,131,907 87	1,460,909 73
Travellers' cheques—domestic	998,051 35	1,279,085 66	1,771,904 82	1,666,630 00	1,405,110 00
" —foreign	1,200,930 00	1,051,621 00	1,416,201 30	1,825,702 27	382,291 71
C. O. D. cheques	3,639,778 93	5,514,821 50	7,309,889 02	8,011,832 00	7,642,034 89
Telegraphic transfers	113,726 91	182,770 07	236,853 43	376,968 55	202,991 38
Letters of credit issued	156,921 01	142,166 30	69,301 96	21,919 27	23,301 25
Other forms	488,660 67	505,179 35	905,550 84	1,197,514 28	656,667 75
	52,165,852 57	56,995,122 78	65,044,193 61	65,897,339 54	54,289,736 17

NUMBER OF OFFICES.

There were 3,614 express offices in Canada in 1915, as compared with 3,305 in 1914.

Financial paper was available at 7,179 offices—an increase of 6 for the year.

EQUIPMENT.

The facts with respect to equipment are given for the year 1915 and two preceding years in the following statement:—

Equipment.	1913.		1914.		1915.	
	Number.	Value.	Number.	Value.	Number.	Value.
		$ cts.		$ cts.		$ cts.
Automobiles	4	10,905 63	16	48,220 54	15	44,804 87
Car safes, stationary	125	24,097 21	125	24,472 21	98	23,645 21
Double wagons	157	44,090 83	159	46,640 04	137	41,976 21
Four wheel trucks	2,381	72,513 25	2,799	84,481 60	3,043	91,544 52
Horses	1,084	203,921 26	1,686	222,974 94	1,031	210,401 49
Messengers' safes	801	18,005 51	849	19,181 46	876	20,451 22
Messengers' packing trunks	1,723	26,301 64	1,729	25,591 37	1,556	22,598 88
Office furniture, etc		80,125 82		91,440 71		101,415 98
Office safes	1,112	115,239 42	1,234	120,644 13	1,306	122,597 73
Single wagons	854	149,500 89	910	160,592 25	938	167,387 35
Sleighs	841	61,085 18	1,000	68,013 16	744	66,728 78
Stable equipment		32,539 34		35,079 56		32,972 89
All other equipment		86,785 35		90,635 32		85,524 15

The aggregate value of equipment in 1915 was $1,032,049.28.

TAXATION.

The tax bill of express companies in 1915 amounted to $123,029.27, which was $1,032.17 less than for the preceding year.

Taxation in 1915 and the three preceding years was distributed among the provinces as follows:—

	1912.	1913.	1914.	1915.
	$ cts.	$ cts.	$ cts.	$ cts.
New Brunswick	1,129 58	946 94	1,247 12	1,301 15
Nova Scotia	440 69	3,135 92	3,506 05	4,822 59
Prince Edward Island	280 20	342 50	677 50	481 48
Quebec	21,156 53	25,619 04	10,793 40	10,452 00
Ontario	46,755 72	56,693 49	60,770 46	74,782 42
Manitoba	3,377 83	3,377 80	5,483 12	4,334 10
Saskatchewan	2,196 74	1,270 67	27,575 83	9,804 04
Alberta	1,695 19	1,560 43	1,705 84	3,984 55
British Columbia	1,820 00	2,292 26	2,233 36	2,678 74
Yukon	.....	60 51	48 60	48 60
Foreign	3,671 71	2,488 37	3,460 06	2,752 58
Undistributed	4,964 39	5,349 81	6,560 10	.....
	87,488 58	103,137 74	124,061 44	123,029 27

I have the honour to be, sir,

Your obedient servant,

J. L. PAYNE,

Comptroller of Statistics.

TABLE 1.—Summary Statement of Operating Mileage and Mileage by Provinces for the year ending June 30, 1915.

No.	Name of Express Company.	Mileage over Steam Roads.	Mileage over Electric Lines.	Mileage over Steamboat Lines.	Mileage over Stage Lines.	Mileage over Miscellaneous Lines.	Total Mileage.	Mileage covered in Outside Operations.
1	American*	1,210·54	11·00	68·00	.....	·75	1,290·29	.....
2	British America	414·04	.....	.....	.....	.....	414·04	.....
3	Canadian	9,398·13	97·00	735·00	17·00	2·00	10,249·13	2,630·00
4	Canadian Northern	6,552·95	36·30	.....	.....	.....	6,589·25	.....
5	Dominion	16,982·32	110·11	1,271·00	58·00	.....	18,421·43	14,181·00
6	Great Northern	680·39	.....	30·00	.....	.....	710·39	.....
7	Wells Fargo & Co	334·36	.....	602·00	.....	.....	936·36	.....
		35,572·73	254·41	2,706·00	75·00	2·75	38,610·89	16,811·00

No.	Company.	New Brunswick.	Nova Scotia.	Prince Edward Island.	Quebec.	Ontario.	Manitoba.
1	American*	.....	.....	.....	335·66	786·23	110·40
2	British America	.....	.....	.....	.....	414·04	.....
3	Canadian	532·50	639·20	298·10	1,368·71	3,809·00	301·00
4	Canadian Northern	.....	.....	.....	585·15	1,244·29	1,826·15
5	Dominion	1,511·36	799·78	270·70	2,366·41	4,022·68	1,686·60
6	Great Northern	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	236·86
7	Wells Fargo & Co	.....	.....	.....	.....	243·66	.....
		2,043·86	1,438·98	568·80	4,655·93	10,519·90	4,161·01

No.	Name of Company.	Saskatchewan.	Alberta.	British Columbia	Yukon.	Foreign.	Total Mileage.
1	American*	.....	.....	58·00	.....	.....	1,290·29
2	British America	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	414·04
3	Canadian	1,046·40	694·20	1,303·00	.....	2,887·02	12,879·13
4	Canadian Northern	2,039·96	850·20	.....	.....	† 43·50	6,589·25
5	Dominion	2,759·60	1,861·40	3,061·90	.....	14,262·00	32,602·43
6	Great Northern	.....	.....	443·53	.....	30·00	710·39
7	Wells Fargo & Co	.....	.....	.....	692·70	.....	936·36
		5,845·96	3,405·80	4,866·43	692·70	17,222·52	55,421·89

*Including the National Express Co. †In U. S.

TABLE 2.—Summary Statement of Capital for the year ending June 30, 1915.

No.	Name of Express Company.	Stocks.		Funded Debt.		
		Common Amount Outstanding	Total Amount Outstanding	Amount Outstanding	Total Capital.	Total Cash Realized on Stocks.
		$ cts.	$ cts.	$ cts.	$ cts.	$ cts.
1	American*					
2	British America	100,000 00	100,000 00		100,000 00	
3	Canadian	1,742,200 00	1,742,200 00		1,742,200 00	902,200 00
4	Canadian Northern	1,000,000 00	1,000,000 00		1,000,000 00	
5	Dominion	2,000,000 00	2,000,000 00	40,000 00	2,040,000 00	2,000,000 00
6	Great Northern					
7	Wells Fargo & Co					
		4,842,200 00	4,842,200 00	40,000 00	4,882,200 00	2,902,200 00

*Including the National Express. Co.

TABLE 3.—Cost of Real Property and Equipment to and including year ending June 30, 1915.

Number.	Name of Express Company.	Account.						
		Real Estate used in Operation.	Buildings and Fixtures used in Operation.	Equipment.				Total Cost.
				Horses.	Vehicles.	Other Equipment.	Total Equipment.	
		$ cts.	$ cts.	$ cts.	$ cts.	$ cts.	$ cts.	$ cts.
1	American*							
2	British America					203 72	203 72	203 72
3	Canadian	260,200 00		54,625 00	69,352 44	63,690 69	187,668 13	447,868 13
4	Canadian Northern		3,433 16	24,077 20	29,250 06	49,587 77	102,915 03	106,348 19
5	Dominion	500,000 00	1,503,968 47	123,956 75	191,749 37	390,515 46	706,221 58	2,710,190 05
6	Great Northern		722 15	567 30	594 45	1,393 60	2,555 35	3,277 50
7	Wells, Fargo & Co							
	Total	760,200 00	1,508,123 78	203,226 25	290,946 32	505,391 24	999,563 81	3,267,887 59

*Including the National Express Co.

TABLE 4.—Summary Statement of Income Account for the year ending June 30, 1915.

No.	Name of Express Company.	Income Account. Gross Receipts from Operations.	Express Privileges — Dr.	Operating Revenues.	Operating Expenses.	Net Operating Revenue.	Net Revenue from Outside Operations.
		$ cts.	$ cts.	$ cts.	$ cts.	$ cts.	$ cts.
1	American*	818,354 39	390,824 62	427,529 77	399,318 14	28,211 63	
2	British America	14,709 49	5,881 30	8,828 19	2,375 09	6,453 10	
3	Canadian	3,208,222 46	1,554,427 61	1,653,794 85	1,576,042 71	77,752 14	5,874 13
4	Canadian Northern	952,723 94	368,180 03	584,543 91	409,292 18	175,251 73	
5	Dominion	6,220,542 26	3,231,715 54	2,985,826 72	3,211,900 93	−226,074 21	21,081 33
6	Great Northern	79,861 27	48,087 72	31,773 55	26,464 39	5,309 16	
7	Wells Fargo & Co.	17,383 39	8,107 29	9,276 10	7,510 72	1,765 38	
		11,311,797 20	5,610,224 11	5,701,573 09	5,632,904 16	68,668 93	26,955 46

Number.	Name of Express Company.	Income Account. Total Net Revenue.	Taxes.	Operating Income.	Other Income.	Gross Corporate Income.	Net Corporate Income.	Balance for Year.
		$ cts.	$ cts.	$ cts.	$ cts.	$ cts.	$ cts.	$ cts.
1	American*	28,211 63	7,587 02	20,624 61		20,624 61	20,624 61	20,624 61
2	British America	6,453 10		6,453 10	113 66	6,566 76	6,566 76	6,566 76
3	Canadian	83,626 27	51,948 57	31,677 70		31,677 70	31,677 70	31,677 70
4	Canadian Northern	175,251 73	3,002 51	172,249 22		172,249 22	172,249 22	172,249 22
5	Dominion	−204,992 88	58,136 22	−263,129 10	104,523 03	−158,606 07	−158,606 07	−158,606 07
6	Great Northern	5,309 16	1,394 56	3,914 60		3,914 60	3,914 60	3,914 60
7	Wells Fargo & Co.	1,765 38	960 39	804 99		804 99	804 99	804 99
		95,624 39	123,029 27	− 27,404 88	104,636 69	77,231 81	77,231 81	77,231 81

*Including the National Express Co.

TABLE 5.—Summary Statement of Operating Revenues for the year ending June 30, 1915.

No.	Name of Express Company.	Revenue from Transportation.			Revenues from Operation other than Transportation.		
		Express Revenue.	Miscellaneous Transportation.	Total Revenue from Transportation.	Money Orders — Domestic.	Money Orders — Foreign.	Travellers' Cheques — Domestic.
		$ cts.	$ cts.	$ cts.	$ cts.	$ cts.	$ cts.
1	American*	777,312 60	1,246 95	778,559 55	5,654 86	104 71	491 97
2	British America	14,709 49	.....	14,709 49	.....	.....	.....
3	Canadian	3,100,781 17	.....	3,100,781 17	60,068 47	.....	.....
4	Canadian Northern	921,729 82	.....	921,729 82	14,854 42	.....	.....
5	Dominion	5,994,518 89	13,405 09	6,007,923 98	104,397 57	15,115 91	2,759 51
6	Great Northern	77,699 96	.....	77,699 96	1,095 06	11 50	.....
7	Wells Fargo & Co	16,214 59	.....	16,214 59	509 21	7 08	177 50
		10,302,966 52	14,652 04	10,917,618 56	186,579 59	15,239 20	3,129 08

No.	Name of Express Company.	Revenues from Operation other than Transportation—*Continued.*					
		Travellers' Cheques — Foreign.	"C.O.D." Checks.	Other Earnings.	Gross Receipts from Operation.	Express Privileges — Dr.	Total Operating Revenues.
		$ cts.	$ cts.	$ cts.	$ cts.	$ cts.	$ cts.
1	American*	212 53	7,212 11	26,118 66	818,354 39	390,824 62	427,529 77
2	British America	.....	.....	.....	14,709 49	5,881 30	8,828 19
3	Canadian	747 81	28,789 57	17,835 44	3,208,222 46	1,554,427 61	1,653,794 85
4	Canadian Northern	.....	16,139 70	.....	952,723 94	368,180 03	584,543 91
5	Dominion	743 84	57,990 21	31,611 24	6,220,542 26	3,234,715 54	2,985,826 72
6	Great Northern	.....	315 37	739 38	79,861 27	48,087 72	31,773 55
7	Wells Fargo & Co	.....	381 61	93 30	17,383 39	8,107 29	9,276 10
		1,704 18	110,828 57	76,398 02	11,311,797 20	5,610,224 11	5,701,573 09

*Including the National Express Co.

SESSIONAL PAPER No. 20e

TABLE 6.—Summary Statement of Operating Expenses for the year ending June 30, 1915.

No.	Name of Express Company.	Maintenance.					
		Superintendence.	Buildings, Fixtures and Grounds.	Office Equipment.	Horses.	Vehicles Repairs.	Vehicles Renewals.
		$ cts.	$ cts.	$ cts.	$ cts.	$ cts.	$ cts.
1	American*	533 24	1,409 10	628 42		8,143 52	
2	British America						
3	Canadian			3,663 41	3,176 50	20,473 36	1,617 79
4	Canadian Northern		122 75	410 96	845 00	3,082 85	8 35
5	Dominion	3,600 00	2,208 44	8,809 65	15,541 21	16,869 35	3,852 68
6	Great Northern	87 70	7 06	224 76	194 20	230 02	70 20
7	Wells Fargo & Co	4 42		7 50			
	Total	4,225 36	3,747 35	13,744 70	19,756 91	48,799 10	5,555 02

No.	Name of Express Company.	Maintenance.					
		Stable Equipment.	Transportation Equipment.	Other Expenses.	Maintaining Joint Facilities. Dr.	Maintaining Joint Facilities. Cr.	Total Maintenance
		$ cts.	$ cts.	$ cts.	$ cts.	$ cts.	$ cts.
1	American*	55 24	939 32	1,088 07			12,796 91
2	British America						
3	Canadian	4,079 52	225 00	1,130 72			34,366 30
4	Canadian Northern	745 84	14 50	45 00			5,275 25
5	Dominion	3,047 00	286 20				54,214 53
6	Great Northern	63 57	57 73	6 30			947 54
7	Wells Fargo & Co	5 12					17 04
	Total	7,996 29	1,522 75	2,270 09			107,617 57

No	Name of Express Company.	Traffic Expenses.						
		Superintendence.	Outside Agencies.	Advertising.	Traffic Associations.	Stationery and Printing.	Other Expenses.	Total Traffic
		$ cts.	$ cts.	$ cts.	$ cts.	$ cts.	$ cts.	$ cts.
1	American*	2,501 21		902 63		543 63	2 27	3,949 74
2	British America					13 76		13 76
3	Canadian	4,086 47		157 50	1,966 55	2,171 88		8,382 40
4	Canadian Northern	2,242 58	87 78	97 68	1,087 10	2,911 38		6,426 52
5	Dominion	32,561 33	581 26	4,673 37	2,816 82	27,853 28	3,017 44	71,503 50
6	Great Northern	272 05		21 32		65 85		359 22
7	Wells Fargo & Co	29 39		20 16		7 96	0 02	57 53
	Total	41,693 03	669 04	5,872 66	5,870 47	33,567 74	3,019 73	90,692 67

* Including the National Express Co.

TABLE 6.—Summary Statement of Operating Expenses for the year ending June 30, 1915—*Continued.*

No.	Name of Express Company.	Transportation Expenses.					
		Superintendence.	Office Employees.	Commissions.	Wagon Employees.	Office Supplies and Expenses.	Rent of Local Offices.
		$ cts.	$ cts.	$ cts.	$ cts.	$ cts.	$ cts.
1	American*	18,220 35	112,351 44	34,272 85	59,991 01	10,948 40	18,935 36
2	British America		387 50	247 54			
3	Canadian	60,047 96	395,615 13	318,768 63	187,454 46	26,237 17	52,286 41
4	Canadian Northern	20,109 63	84,377 19	74,253 77	54,189 58	6,200 37	14,819 70
5	Dominion	169,511 85	639,792 39	340,881 31	289,253 73	109,818 66	499,817 47
6	Great Northern	1,013 75	5,512 76	4,361 39	3,766 03	482 88	1,370 92
7	Wells Fargo & Co	254 14	2,083 50	1,709 35		273 67	
	Total	269,157 68	1,240,119 91	774,494 84	594,654 81	153,961 15	587,229 86

No.	Name of Express Company.	Transportation Expenses—*Con.*					
		Stable Employees.	Stable Supplies and Expenses.	Train Employees.	Train Supplies and Expenses.	Transfer Employees.	Transfer Expenses.
		$ cts.	$ cts.	$ cts.	$ cts.	$ cts.	$ cts.
1	American*	7,928 25	27,776 56	29,060 62	2,557 11		
2	British America			319 20		8 15	
3	Canadian	18,069 63	109,991 36	148,876 18			
4	Canadian Northern	2,721 05	29,595 43	54,570 07	106 36	3,604 12	589 62
5	Dominion	31,020 19	228,744 70	307,562 25	3,409 96	19,111 07	10,482 89
6	Great Northern	221 85	1,666 09	3,243 71	18 02		
7	Wells Fargo & Co			1,377 40	2 75	1,326 50	
	Total	59,960 97	397,774 14	545,009 43	6,094 20	24,049 84	11,072 51

No.	Name of Express Company.	Transportation Expenses—*Con.*					
		Stationery and Printing.	Loss and Damage Freight.	Loss and Damage Money.	Damage to Property.	Injuries to Persons.	Other Expenses.
		$ cts.	$ cts.	$ cts.	$ cts.	$ cts.	$ cts.
1	American*	6,802 07	15,623 84		181 35	984 58	7,470 19
2	British America	372 93	40 99				
3	Canadian	32,062 94	53,616 93		270 34	1,313 05	6,408 21
4	Canadian Northern	13,598 63	4,595 54	89 66	17 78	1,558 01	251 09
5	Dominion	79,333 39	55,491 55	9,673 99	747 81	9,702 13	18,780 00
6	Great Northern	605 02	698 90		5 97	625 29	
7	Wells Fargo & Co	112 85	3 17				
	Total	132,887 83	130,070 92	9,763 65	1,223 25	14,183 06	32,909 49

*Including the National Express Co.

SESSIONAL PAPER No. 20c

TABLE 6.—Summary Statement of Operating Expenses for the year ending June 30, 1915—*Continued.*

No	Name of Express Company.	Transportation Expenses—*Con.*			General Expenses.		
		Operating Joint Facilities. Dr.	Operating Joint Facilities. Cr.	Total Transportation	Salaries and Expenses General Officers.	Salaries and Expenses Clerks and Attendants.	General Office Supplies and Expenses.
		$ cts.	$ cts.	$ cts.	$ cts.	$ cts.	$ cts.
1	American*			353,103 98	2,442 58	16,050 21	1,850 23
2	British America			1,376 31		360 00	500 73
3	Canadian			1,411,018 40	31,478 21	55,498 14	9,751 74
4	Canadian Northern	1,585 64	4,356 77	362,476 47	6,663 16	21,557 08	2,189 56
5	Dominion			2,823,135 34	37,667 14	130,711 33	10,703 92
6	Great Northern			23,592 58	178 07	1,037 16	112 20
7	Wells Fargo & Co			7,143 33	25 07	170 88	7 45
	Total	1,585 64	4,356 77	4,981,846 41	78,454 23	225,384 80	25,115 83

No.	Name of Express Company.	General Expenses—*Continued.*					
		Law Expenses.	Insurance.	Pensions.	Stationery and Printing.	Other Expenses.	Total General Expenses.
		$ cts.	$ cts.	$ cts.	$ cts.	$ cts.	$ cts.
1	American*	1,526 98	4,085 12	2,340 95	368 64	802 80	29,467 51
2	British America				36 83	87 46	985 02
3	Canadian	628 77	6,281 88	6,000 00	1,324 03	11,312 84	122,275 61
4	Canadian Northern	159 38	2,889 15		1,024 92	630 69	35,113 94
5	Dominion	2,473 48	7,311 46	30,000 00	3,679 81	40,500 42	263,047 56
6	Great Northern	25 60	125 80		39 67	46 55	1,565 05
7	Wells Fargo & Co	18 31	25 08	7 85	8 13	30 05	292 82
	Total	4,832 52	20,718 49	38,348 80	6,482 03	53,410 81	452,747 51

No	Name of Express Company.	Recapitulation of Expenses.				
		Maintenance.	Traffic Expenses.	Transportation Expenses.	General Expenses.	Total Operating Expenses.
		$ cts.	$ cts.	$ cts.	$ cts.	$ cts.
1	American*	12,796 91	3,949 74	353,103 98	29,467 51	399,318 14
2	British America		13 76	1,376 31	985 02	2,375 09
3	Canadian	34,366 30	8,382 40	1,411,018 40	122,275 61	1,576,042 71
4	Canadian Northern	5,275 25	6,426 52	362,476 47	35,113 94	409,292 18
5	Dominion	54,214 53	71,503 50	2,823,135 34	263,047 56	3,211,900 93
6	Great Northern	947 54	359 22	23,592 58	1,565 05	26,464 39
7	Wells Fargo & Co	17 04	57 53	7,143 33	292 82	7,510 72
	Total	107,617 57	90,692 67	4,981,846 41	452,747 51	5,632,904 16

*Including the National Express Co.

TABLE 7.—Summary Statement of Taxes and Assessments by Provinces for the year ending June 30, 1915.

No.	Name of Express Company.	Provinces.					
		New Brunswick.	Nova Scotia.	Prince Edward Island.	Quebec.	Ontario.	Manitoba.
		$ cts.	$ cts.	$ cts.	$ cts.	$ cts.	$ cts.
1	American*	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....
2	British America	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....
3	Canadian	566 27	2,289 39	215 00	8,016 08	37,325 29	347 00
4	Canadian Northern	.....	.....	.....	253 02	435 69	559 55
5	Dominion	734 88	2,533 20	266 48	2,182 90	36,271 44	3,163 35
6	Great Northern	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	264 20
7	Wells Fargo & Co	.....	.....	.....	.....	750 00	.....
		1,301 15	4,822 59	481 48	10,452 00	74,782 42	4,334 10

No.	Name of Express Company.	Provinces—*Continued.*					
		Saskatchewan.	Alberta.	British Columbia.	Yukon.	Foreign.	Total Amount.
		$ cts.	$ cts.	$ cts.	$ cts.	$ cts.	$ cts.
1	American*	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	†7,587 02
2	British America	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....
3	Canadian	71 40	1,202 52	200 00	.....	1,715 62	51,948 57
4	Canadian Northern	474 55	242 74	.....	.....	1,036 96	3,002 51
5	Dominion	9,258 09	2,539 29	1,186 59	.....	.....	58,136 22
6	Great Northern	.....	.....	1,130 36	.....	.....	1,394 56
7	Wells Fargo & Co	.....	.....	161 79	48 60	.....	960 39
		9,804 04	3,984 55	2,678 74	48 60	2,752 58	123,029 27

†Not distributed. *Including the National Express Co.

SESSIONAL PAPER No. 20e

TABLE 8.—Summary Statement of Equipment Owned for the year ending June 30, 1915.

No.	Name of Express Company.	Automobiles.		Car Safes — Stationary.		Double Wagons.		Four Wheeled Trucks.		Horse and other Draft Animals.	
		No.	Amount. $ cts.	No.	Amount. $ cts.	No.	Amount. $ cts.	No.	Amount. $ cts.	No.	Amount. $ cts.
1	American*					10	1,738 48	127	1,205 70	40	6,589 44
2	British America										
3	Canadian	5	17,366 44	4	750 00	46	10,055 00	666	12,860 00	356	54,625 00
4	Canadian Northern	2	5,666 00			9	2,810 50	255	10,852 04	93	24,663 00
5	Dominion	8	21,772 43	94	22,895 21	72	27,372 23	1977	66,261 18	537	123,956 75
6	Great Northern							17	359 60	5	567 30
7	Wells Fargo & Co							1	6 00		
		15	44,804 87	98	23,645 21	137	41,976 21	3043	91,544 52	1031	210,401 49

No.	Name of Express Company.	Messengers' Safes.		Messengers' Packing Trunks.		Office Furniture and Fixtures	Office Safes.		Single Wagons.	
		No.	Amount. $ cts.	No.	Amount. $ cts.	Amount. $ cts.	No.	Amount. $ cts.	No.	Amount. $ cts.
1	American*	9	69 12			8,635 53	58	2,395 15	29	3,510 59
2	British America	1	35 00				1	143 38		
3	Canadian	190	2,500 00	110	1,650 00	23,810 00	308	13,850 00	298	30,551 00
4	Canadian Northern	137	4,180 96	14	227 80	6,916 13	233	22,177 06	79	15,501 82
5	Dominion	535	13,623 89	1432	20,721 08	61,786 62	692	82,585 25	527	117,252 14
6	Great Northern	4	42 25			90 70	9	522 00	5	571 80
7	Wells Fargo & Co					177 00	5	924 89		
		876	20,451 22	1556	22,598 88	101,415 98	1306	122,597 73	938	167,387 35

No	Name of Express Company.	Sleighs.		Stable Equipment	All other Equipment	Total Number.	Total Amount.
		No.	$ cts	$ cts.	$ cts.	$ cts.	$ cts.
1	American*	30	1,775 05	14 85	1,055 58	303 00	26,989 49
2	British America				25 34	2 00	203 72
3	Canadian	249	11,380 00	7,620 09	650 60	2,232 00	187,668 13
4	Canadian Northern	72	6,426 08	4,967 54	2,914 19	894 00	107,303 12
5	Dominion	392	47,125 00	20,315 31	80,554 49	6,266 00	706,221 58
6	Great Northern	1	22 65	55 10	323 95	41	2,555 35
7	Wells Fargo & Co					6	1,107 89
		744	66,728 78	32,972 89	85,524 15	9,744	1,032,049 28

*Including the National Express Co.

TABLE 9.—Summary Statement of Financial Paper Issued for the year ending June 30, 1915.

No	Name of Express Company.	Money Orders Sold.		Travellers' Cheques.			
		Domestic.	Foreign.	Domestic.	Foreign.	"C.O.D." Checks Issued.	Telegraphic Transfers.
		$ cts.	$ cts	$ cts.	$ cts.	$ cts.	$ cts
1	American*	1,354,337 85		935,650 00	256,200 00	166,367 53	17,993 50
2	British America						
3	Canadian	10,385,709 55			106,881 71	1,733,691 97	50,968 87
4	Canadian Northern	4,139,350 55				1,267,209 27	
5	Dominion	26,237,215 07	1,457,822 58	439,230 00	19,210 00	4,335,794 23	104,524 61
6	Great Northern	256,980 07	766 15			110,998 94	
7	Wells Fargo & Co.	142,836 37	2,321 00	30,230 00		27,972 95	29,504 40
		42,516,429 46	1,460,909 73	1,405,110 00	382,291 71	7,642,034 89	202,991 38

No.	Name of Express Company.	Letters of Credit Issued.	Other Forms of Remittance Paper Issued.	Total		Number of Express Offices in Canada.	Number of Offices having Money Orders on Sale.
				Number.	Amount.		
		$ cts.	$ cts.		$ cts.		
1	American*	23,301 25	87,557 64	160,866	2,841,407 77	146	117
2	British America					11	
3	Canadian		361,230 55	1,060,496	12,638,482 65	1,026	964
4	Canadian Northern			414,930	5,406,559 82	664	691
5	Dominion		207,879 56	2,557,237	32,801,676 05	1,717	5,361
6	Great Northern			18,417	368,745 16	39	39
7	Wells Fargo & Co.			6,178	232,864 72	11	7
		23,301 25	656,667 75	4,218,124	54,289,736 17	3,614	7,179

*Including the National Express Co.

TELEGRAPH STATISTICS

OF THE

DOMINION OF CANADA

FOR THE

YEAR ENDED JUNE 30

1915

PRINTED BY ORDER OF PARLIAMENT

OTTAWA
PRINTED BY J. DE L. TACHÉ, PRINTER TO THE KING'S MOST EXCELLENT MAJESTY
1916

[No. 20F—1916]

To Field Marshal, His Royal Highness Prince Arthur William Patrick Albert, Duke of Connaught and of Strathearn, K.G., K.T., K.P., etc., etc., etc., Governor General and Commander in Chief of the Dominion of Canada.

May it please Your Royal Highness:

The undersigned has the honour to present to your Royal Highness the Annual Report of the Comptroller of Statistics in relation to the telegraph interests of the Dominion of Canada for the year ended June 30, 1915.

F. COCHRANE,
Minister of Railways and Canals.

To the Honourable F. COCHRANE,
Minister of Railways and Canals.

SIR,—I have the honour to submit the report of the Comptroller of Statistics in relation to the telegraph interests of the Dominion of Canada for the year ended June 30, 1915.

I have the honour to be sir,

Your obedient servant,

A. W. CAMPBELL,
Deputy Minister of Railways and Canals.

OFFICE OF THE COMPTROLLER OF STATISTICS,
OTTAWA, March 15, 1916.

A. W. CAMPBELL, Esq., C.E.,
Deputy Minister of Railways and Canals.

SIR,—I have the honour to submit herewith Telegraph Statistics for the year ended June 30, 1915.

As in preceding years, all the telegraph organizations operating in Canada made reports in accordance with the statistical requirements of the Department.

It is not deemed expedient to repeat the historical data which appeared in Telegraph Statistics for 1911 and 1912. The purpose then in view has been served.

The reports for 1915 show a decline in operating results as compared with the preceding year. The details will be found in subsequent paragraphs of these introductory observations, and in tables constituting the body of the report.

ORGANIZATION.

The following data with respect to organization on June 30, 1914, are collateral to the statistical tables on succeeding pages:—

Anglo-American Telegraph Company, Limited.—Chairman of the Board, Francis A. Bevan; Directors, Messrs. Francis A. Bevan, Robert H. Benson, and Sir Herbert S. Leon, Bart.; Secretary, William Miles, Winchester House, Old Bond Street, London, England. The Company has leased its whole undertaking to the Western Union Telegraph Company, of New York, for 99 years from 1st April, 1911.

Canadian Northern Telegraph Company.—President, Sir William Mackenzie; Vice-Presidents, Sir Donald Mann and D. B. Hanna; Directors, Sir William Mackenzie, Sir Donald Mann, Messrs. Z. A. Lash, K.C., R. J. Mackenzie, and D. B. Hanna; Secretary, R. P. Ormsby; Treasurer, L. W. Mitchell; Solicitor, Gerard Ruel; General Auditor, J. D. Morton; General Superintendent, W. C. Muir. The headquarte s of the Company are at Toronto.

Canadian Pacific Railway Company's Telegraph.—President, Sir Thomas G. Shaughnessy, K.C.V.O.; Vice-Presidents, I. G. Ogden, G. M. Bosworth, and G. Bury, E. W. Beatty, G. Hall; Directors, Sir Thomas G. Shaugnessy, Sir Thomas Skinner, Bart., Sir William C. Van Horne, Sir Edmund B. Osler, M.P., R. B. Angus, H. S. Holt, W. D. Matthews, C. R. Hosmer, A. M. Nanton, Hon. Robert Mackay, D. McNicholl, and Hon. James Dunsmuir, J. K. L. Ross; Secretary, W. R. Baker, C.V.O.; Treasurer, H. E. Suckling; General Counsel, E. W. Beatty; Comptroller, J. Leslie; General Auditor, F. E. Shrimpton; Manager, J. McMillan. The headquarters of the Company are at Montreal.

Dominion Government Telegraph Service.—This service is administered by the Department of Public Works, Ottawa. Mr. D. H. Keeley is the General Superintendent. Operations are carried on in those outlying sections of the Dominion which are not served by commercial telegraph organizations.

Grand Trunk Pacific Telegraph Company.—President, E. J. Chamberlin; Vice-Presidents, M. Donaldson and W. H. Ardley; Directors, Messrs. E. J. Chamberlin, W. H. Biggar, W. H. Ardley, M. Donaldson, Howard G. Kelley, and A. B. Smith; Secretary, Henry Phillips; Treasurer, Frank Scott; General Counsel, W. H. Biggar, K. C.; Auditor, W. H. Ardley, Manager, A. B. Smith. Headquarters, Montreal.

Great North Western Telegraph Company.—President, Z. A. Lash; Vice-President, Adam Brown; Directors, Messrs. Adam Brown, James Hedley, Newcomb Carlton, Hon. J. K. Kerr, E. Y. Gallaher, A. Jarvis, F. B. Hayes, and Z. A. Lash; Secretary, A. C. McConnell; Treasurer, D. E. Henry; General Manager, George D. Perry. Headquarters, Toronto.

North American Telegraph Company.—President, C. F. Sise; Vice-President, Hon. Robert Mackay; Directors, Messrs. C. F. Sise, Hon. Robert Mackay, Robert Archer, Hugh Paton, Charles Cassils, L. B. McFarlane, and W. H. Black; Secretary-Treasurer, J. H. Hoppes, Kingston, Ontario.

Temiskaming and Northern Ontario Railway Commission.—Chairman of the Board, J. L. Englehart; Commissioners, Denis Murphy and George W. Lee; Secretary-Treasurer, W. H. Maund; Accountant, T. J. Gracey. Headquarters, Toronto.

Western Union Te egraph Company.—President, Newcomb Carlton; Vice-Presidents, G. W. E. Atkins and Belvidere Brooks; Directors, Messrs. Oliver Ames, William Vincent Astor, Henry A. Bishop, Newcomb Carlton, Robert C. Clowry, Henry W. DeForest, Chauncey M. Depew, William Fahnestock, Donald G. Geddes, Geo. J. Gould, Thomas H. Hubbard, Chauncey Keep, Robert S. Lovett, Edwin G. Merrill, Percy A. Rockefeller, Jacob H. Schiff, Mortimer L. Schiff, James Stillman, William H. Truesdale, and Albert H. Wiggin; Secretary, William H. Baker; Treasurer, Lewis Dresdner; Comptroller, E. Y. Gallaher; General Attorney, George H. Faerons. Headquarters, 195 Broadway, New York.

Halifax and Bermudas Cable Company, Limited.—President, Sir Thomas Skinner, Baronet; Directors, Sir Thomas Skinner, Bart., George Gray Ward, Frederick Ward, Thomas Hewitt-Skinner, and William Morrey Kent; General Manager and Secretary, Joseph Rippon, 33 Old Broad Street, London, England.

Pacific Cable Board.—Chairman of the Board, Sir H. Babington Smith, K.C.B., C.S.I., Sir W. H. Mercer, K.C.M.G. (Crown Agent for Colonies), and Sir G. O. Gibb, Chairman Road Board, representing the Imperial Government; Vice-Chairmen, A. Lang, Hon. G. H. Perley, representing Canadian Government, Right Hon. Sir G. H. Reid, P.C., G.C.M.G. (High Commissioner for Australia), Sir T. A. Coghlan, K.B., I.S.O. (Agent General for New South Wales) representing Australian Government, Hon T. MacKenzie (High Commissioner for New Zealand) representing New Zealand Government; Secretary, F. J. Adye; Manager (stationed in the Pacific), J. Milward.

Marconi Wireless Telegraph Company.—President, Andrew A. Allan; Vice-President, Guglielmo Marconi, D.Sc., LL.D.; Directors, J. N. Greenshields, K.C., Robert Bickerdike, M.P., G. M. Bosworth, W. D. Birchall, Godfrey C. Isaacs, E. J. Nally, and J. H. Lauer; Secretary-Treasurer, Alex. E. Reoch. Headquarters, Montreal.

CAPITALIZATION AND COST.

The situation with respect to both capitalization and cost is somewhat confusing. There are a number of organizations which have neither stocks nor bonds outstanding, and which are unable to report the cost of their telegraph systems. The Canadian Pacific Railway Company's telegraph is a case in point. Primarily, many of the lines were built as a part of the railway system of the Company, and the cost was wrapped up with capital expenditures for purely railway purposes. Many stretches of wire are also used for both train despatching and the transmission of commercial messages. The case of the Pacific Cable Board illustrates another aspect of the matter. This cable line is owned jointly by the United Kingdom and the several British Dominions concerned, and the cost for the purposes of these statistics is the cost of equipment within the Dominion of Canada. With these explanations the facts given herewith will be understood.

Following is the capitalization of companies having headquarters in Canada:—

	Stocks.	Bonds.
	$	$
Canadian Northern Telegraph Company	500,000	800,000
Grand Trunk Pacific Telegraph Company	100,000	
Great North Western Telegraph Company	500,000	
Marconi Wireless Telegraph Company	5,000,000	
North American Telegraph Company	200,000	
Total	6,300,000	800,000

The figures of cost relating to Canadian companies were as follows:—

Canadian Pacific Railway Company's Telegraph	$6,696,421
Dominion Government Telegraph Service	2,829,890
North American Telegraph Company	56,663
Pacific Cable Board	55,000
Temiskaming and Northern Ontario	39,800
Total	$9,677,774

Table No. 1 will afford information with respect to the capitalization of companies having headquarters outside of Canada.

EARNINGS AND OPERATING EXPENSES.

Receipts from operation in 1915 amounted to $5,536,337.46, as against $5,983,204.04 in 1914. This involved a decrease for the year of $446,866.58.

It should be explained that the earnings of the Western Union Telegraph Company include an arbitrary assignment of a certain amount for such business as is merely relayed across certain portions of Canada from the cable station at Canso, N.S., to points in the United States.

Following were the accounts which made up gross revenue in 1915 and the three preceding years:—

	1912	1913.	1914.	1915
	$ cts.	$ cts.	$ cts.	$ cts.
Local messages	2,751,190 21	3,187,127 53	2,859,101 22	2,562,563 60
Conjoint messages	1,385,586 01	1,409,449 78	1,358,194 12	1,187,638 21
Press reports	158,839 88	123,568 89	143,798 85	122,422 04
Market reports	98,437 70	103,710 58	99,638 33	40,723 86
Cablegrams	484,713 68	682,456 78	711,326 89	806,309 23
Money Orders	40,770 61	49,730 08	56,416 96	39,975 56
Leased wires	288,009 44	297,083 40	305,746 19	279,018 76
Miscellaneous	151,339 39	242,085 84	448,981 48	497,686 17
Total	5,359,188 92	6,095,212 90	5,983,204 04	5,536,337 46

By comparing the several items in the foregoing statement a fair understanding will be had of the fluctuations in revenue during the past four years. It will be observed, for example, that, while a large increment has occurred in receipts from cablegrams, local messages have yielded a considerably lower revenue. It is not easy to indentify the cause of this latter change, except it be in the increasing use of the telephone.

Operating expenses in 1915 had a total of $4,129,165.82. The amount in 1914 was $4,242,539.73.

Operating expenses were equal to 75·07 per cent of gross earnings. There has been a steady rise in this since 1912. The record is as follows:—

1912	$65·83	1914	$70 91
1913	66 84	1915	74 59

The difference between gross earnings and operating expenses in 1915 was $1,407,171.61, as compared with $1,740,664.31 in 1914. The facts in this regard for the past four years are shown in the following statement:—

1912	$1,831,367	1914	$1,740,664
1913	2,060,732	1915	1,407,172

It is impracticable, owing to the situation already described, to measure these net earnings against capitalization; but table 1 will supply the information for such calculations as are possible.

Following are the details of operating expenses in 1915 and the three preceding years:—

	1912	1913.	1914	1915
	$ cts.	$ cts.	$ cts.	$ cts.
Salaries and wages	2,583,887 50	2,884,590 20	2,908,697 07	2,735,956 57
Stationery and printing	31,060 14	29,442 65	39,133 22	40,979 18
Line and equipment	372,344 25	402,149 33	674,086 18	762,658 14
Buildings	229,046 58	241,486 31	271,155 67	257,427 28
Legal expenses	2,177 40	3,918 59	2,858 35	743 19
Insurance	3,960 37	2,448 24	5,186 25	7,856 93
Commissions	143,070 03	141,854 06	130,877 51	114,840 11
Taxes	23,665 25	20,539 05	30,971 86	31,257 87
Miscellaneous	138,610 44	308,072 00	179,573 62	177,446 52
Total	3,527,821 96	4,034,480 43	4,242,539 73	4,129,165 82

The following statement shows how gross earnings in 1915 and three years preceding were distributed among the various companies:—

	1912.	1913.	1914.	1915.
	$ cts.	$ cts.	$ cts.	$ cts.
Canadian Northern Telegraph Company	226,445 45	276,739 70	264,615 03	149,785 67
Canadian Pacific Railway Company	3,009,767 84	3,286,508 95	2,991,273 06	2,504,241 50
Dominion Government Telegraph Service	200,330 20	215,526 11	253,112 57	225,944 27
Grand Trunk Pacific Telegraph Company	55,392 47	72,126 80	81,975 51	75,268 01
Great North Western Telegraph Company	1,161,414 92	1,244,302 67	1,252,930 14	1,295,774 91
Halifax and Bermudas Cable Company	68,805 00	69,710 00	77,465 00	87,930 00
Marconi Wireless Telegraph Company	143,018 00	218,660 00	239,006 70	306,615 47
North American Telegraph Company	26,331 42	22,023 49	23,849 95	19,843 40
Pacific Cable Board	73,861 40	85,166 60	98,558 25	113,657 52
Temiskaming and Northern Ontario Commission	38,932 03	36,297 73	32,165 17	24,912 01
Western Union Telegraph Company	354,888 19	568,150 85	668,252 66	732,364 70
Total	5,359,188 92	6,095,212 90	5,983,204 04	5,536,337 46

Operating expenses in 1915 and the three years preceding were distributed among the reporting units as follows:—

	1912.	1913.	1914.	1915.
	$ cts.	$ cts.	$ cts.	$ cts.
Canadian Northern Telegraph Company	108,143 11	141,742 68	153,603 95	89,693 28
Canadian Pacific Railway Company	1,435,944 28	1,691,953 38	1,613,687 64	1,382,507 16
Dominion Government Telegraph Service	505,731 73	491,550 80	623,755 29	632,674 98
Grand Trunk Pacific Telegraph Company	48,264 54	62,236 13	93,870 12	195,405 76
Great North Western Telegraph Company	839,602 95	911,884 98	947,964 56	993,495 52
Halifax and Bermuda Cable Company	26,140 00	25,695 00	20,403 00	25,200 00
Marconi Wireless Telegraph Company	148,485 00	218,597 00	231,848 08	285,552 85
North American Telegraph Company	13,983 16	21,084,55	21,607 59	21,640 24
Pacific Cable Board	122,708 13	69,649 69	76,146 92	85,753 07
Temiskaming and Northern Ontario Commission	11,990 25	12,495 34	11,150,00	13,190 72
Western Union Telegraph Company	266,828 81	387,590 88	448,502 58	494,052 24
Total	3,527,821 96	4,034,480 43	4,242,539 73	4,129,165 82

INCOME ACCOUNT.

Following is a summary of table 4 in relation to the Income Account of telegraph organizations:—

Gross revenue	$5,294,593 49	
Operating expenses	3,467,058 71	
Net operating revenue		$1,857,672 53
Additions—		
From outside operations	$ 3,353 17	
Rents	11,134 03	
From securities held	1,312 50	
Other items		
		15,799 70
Gross corporate income		$1,873,472 23
Deductions—		
Taxes	$ 24,182 00	
Interest on bonds	20,000 00	
Other deductions	26,907 94	
		71,089 94
Net corporate income		$ 1,802,382 92
Disposal of net corporate income—		
Dividends	$ 226,914 00	
Reserves	27,996 73	
		254,910 73
Balance		$ 1,547,471 56

The outstanding feature in the foregoing statement, as was also the case in 1914, is the large balance carried forward to profit and loss. The details may be studied in table 4.

EQUIPMENT.

During the year careful enquiries were made looking to the enlargement of the schedule at present prescribed with respect to equipment, but difficulties were encountered. There has not been a definite standardization of telegraphic instruments. It is believed, however, that this obstacle to the elaboration of the existing official schedule can be fairly met. The matter will have further attention during the current year.

Following are the facts with respect to pole and wire mileage, by provinces, for 1915 and the three years preceding.

Province.	Pole Mileage.				Wire Mileage.			
	1912	1913.	1914.	1915.	1912.	1913.	1914	1915.
Nova Scotia	2,828	2,907·25	2,931·75	2,944·00	9,878	9,412·49	10,912·23	11,474·45
New Brunswick	1,867	2,251·25	1,910·25	2,000·25	8,376	7,297·34	8,444·79	8,690·80
Quebec	7,515	7,035·25	6,851·00	6,836·25	24,249	25,242·20	22,296·25	22,579 00
Ontario	10,514	11,166·90	11,258·40	11,164·40	58,207	47,682·55	66,245·55	66,183 35
Manitoba	3,803	3,808·00	3,908·75	4,210 40	18,184	13,697·10	19,377·80	21,884·75
Saskatchewan	5,382	5,863·65	6,749·10	6,947·85	21,257	19,499·80	26·830·40	27·062·05
Alberta	2,895	3,476·05	4,050,50	4,949·20	14,491	16,193·05	19,286·70	22,494·75
British Columbia	3,467	5,838·14	6,699·64	7,319·31	10,571	13,192·46	19·181·72	21,866·25
Yukon	2,498	688·00	688·00	586·00	2,713	688·00	588·00	586·00
Newfoundland	14	14·00	14·00	14·00	14	14·00	14·00	14·00
	40,785	43,048·49	45,061·39	46,971·66	167,939	152,918·99	193,277·44	202,835·40

It will be observed that substantial increases took place during the year in both pole and wire mileage. The latter is the more important, since it indicates a larger availability of telegraph service.

The wire mileage in 1915 and three preceding years was distributed, by classes, as follows:—

	1912.	1913.	1914.	1915.
	Miles.	Miles.	Miles.	Miles.
Galvanized	116,974	122,168	126,886	132,343
Copper—overhead	50,100	29,417	21,606	27,812
Copper—underground	254	698	737	748
Copper—submarine	689	636	653	649
Multiple	36,218	39,794	43,395	41,283

"Multiple" must be understood as applying to wire used for the duplex and quadruplex systems. Each mile of wire is, however, capable of serving the purpose of from two to four miles under ordinary conditions. The count is based on actual mileage of wire.

PUBLIC SERVICE.

The decline in gross earnings, particularly from local messages, is reflected in a lower public service by telegraphic organizations in 1915. The number of land messages decreased during the year from 11,980,869 to 9,952,135. The record of land messages since statistics were available is as follows:—

1912	9,252,540	1914	11,980,869
1913	11,176,753	1915	9,952,135

The number of cablegrams was 977,389, as compared with 983,061 in 1914. The falling off in numbers in this instance was coincident with an increase in revenue from cable service, showing that the average toll per message was higher for the year. The cablegram record is as follows:—

1912	768,559	1914	983,061
1913	877,534	1915	977,389

EMPLOYEES.

The returns for 1915 showed a small increase in the number of employees. The figures for the year were 6,243, as against 6,150 for 1914.

There were 4,010 operators, of whom 3,677 were males, and 333 females. In 1914 there were 3,062 males and 319 female operators,

Other officers and employees numbered 2,233, a decline of 536 for the year.

Salaries and wages had a total of $2,946,327.74, as compared with $3,214,140.44 in 1914.

The foregoing total of salaries and wages was equal to 71.3 per cent. of operating expenses. In 1914 the ratio was 75.8.

NUMBER OF OFFICES.

For the first time the facts with respect to the number of offices, and their distribution by provinces, were ascertained. The returns gave the following results:—

Nova Scotia	288
New Brunswick	159
Prince Edward Island	2
Quebec	817
Ontario	1,246
Manitoba	420
Saskatchewan	610
Alberta	296
British Columbia	643
Yukon	54
Total	4,535

FINANCIAL PAPER.

It was deemed advisable to require telegraph corporations to report the amount of financial paper handled, and the returns disclosed a total of $665,254.92 for 1915. This information was not gathered in previous years, so that comparisons are impracticable.

STATISTICAL TABLES.

Following these introductory observations and summaries are tables giving statistical information in detail with regard to the various reporting units.

I have the honour to be, sir,
Your obedient servant,

J. L. PAYNE.
Comptroller of Statistics.

Table 1.—Capital Liability, Cost, Gross Revenue, and Operating Expenses.

Name of Company.	Address.	Capital Stock.	Funded Debt.	Cost of Real Property and Equipment.	Revenue from Operation.	Operating Expenses.	Net Operating Revenue.	Net Operating Loss.
		$ cts.	$ cts.	$ cts.	$ cts.	$ cts.	$ cts.	$ cts.
Anglo-American Telegraph Co., Ltd	London, Eng.	34,066,666 66		34,066,666 66				
American Telegraph and Cable Co	New York	14,000,000 00						
†Canadian Northern Telegraph Co	Toronto	500,000 00	800,000 00		149,785 67	89,693 28	60,092 39	
Canadian Pacific Railway Co.	Montreal			6,696,421 10	2,504,241 50	1,382,507 16	1,121,734 34	
Direct United States Cable Co., Ltd.	London, Eng.	5,909,106 66		5,909,106 66				
Dominion Government Telegraph Service	Ottawa			2,829,890 00	225,941 27	632,671 98		406,730 71
Grand Trunk Pacific Telegraph Co.	Montreal	100,000 00			75,268 01	105,405 76		30,137 75
Great North Western Telegraph Co. of Canada	Toronto	500,000 00			1,295,774 91	993,495 52	302,279 39	
Halifax and Bermudas Cable Co., Ltd.	London, Eng.	250,000 00		757,740 00	87,930 00	25,200 00	62,730 00	
Marconi Wireless Telegraph Co. of Canada, Ltd.	Montreal	5,000,000 00		527,466 13	306,615 47	285,552 85	21,062 62	
North American Telegraph Co.	Kingston, Ont.	200,000 00		56,662 93	19,843 40	21,640 24		1,796 84
Pacific Cable Board	London, Eng.		8,723,168 00	*55,000 00	113,657,52	85,753 07	27,904 45	
Temiskaming and Northern Ontario Railway Commission	Toronto			39,800 00	24,912 01	13,190 72	11,721 29	
Western Union Telegraph Co.	New York	99,817,100 00	32,602,000 00	145,125,186 26	732,364 70	494,052 24	238,312 46	
Totals		160,342,873 32	42,125,168 00	196,063,940 04	5,536,337 46	4,129,165 82	1,845,836 94	438,665 30

* In Canada only. † For half-year ended Dec. 31, 1914.

Table 2.—Gross Revenue and the Sources Thereof.

Name of Company.	Local Messages.	Conjoint Messages.	Press Reports.	Market Reports.	Cablegrams	Money Orders.	Leased Wire.	Miscellaneous.	Total Gross Revenue.
	$ cts.	$ cts.	$ cts.	$ cts.	$ cts.	$ cts.	$ cts.	$ cts.	$ cts.
§Canadian Northern Telegraph Co.	133,247 63	5,623 42	3,289 04	1,906 82	193 25	1,614 91	3,153 25	757 35	149,785 61
Canadian Pacific Railway Co.	1,601,020 36	399,273 48	23,805 35	4,176 65	191,094 11	16,487 36	245,856 78	22,527 41	2,504,241 50
Dominion Government Telegraph Service		225,944 27							225,944 27
Grand Trunk Pacific Telegraph Co.	70,000 39	1,980 40						3,287 22	75,268 01
Great North Western Telegraph Co. of Canada	412,464 22	525,897 81	76,964 07	33,460 36	121,595 37	14,998 03	26,655 56	83,739 49	1,295,774 9
Halifax and Bermudas Cable Co., Ltd.			2,290 00		75,378 00			10,262 00	87,930 00
Marconi Wireless Telegraph Co. of Canada, Ltd.	ϕ 61,234 8		840 42		56,969 52			‡187,570 71	306,615 17
North American Telegraph Co.	2,698 44	13,022 17	†	†	635 18	119 89	3,353 17	11 55	19,843 40
Pacific Cable Board					113,657 52				113,657 52
Temiskaming and Northern Ontario Railway Commission	8,825 60	15,896 69			189 72				24,912 01
Western Union Telegraph Co.	273,072 14		15,233 16	1,180 03	246,596 56	7,655 37		*189,527 44	732,364 70
Totals	2,562,563 60	1,187,638 24	122,422 01	40,723 86	806,309 23	39,975 56	279,018 76	497,686 17	5,536,337 46

ϕ Ship's messages. * Includes $188,522.22 cable expenses at relay stations. † Included in conjoint. ‡ Includes subsidies. § For six months ending Dec. 31, 1914.

Table 3.—Operating Expenses.

Name of Company.	Salaries.	Stationery and Printing.	Maintenance of Line and Equipment	Maintenance of Buildings, etc.	Legal Expenses.	Insurance.	Commissions.	Taxes.	Miscellaneous.	Operating Expenses.
	$ cts.	$ cts.	$ cts.	$ cts.	$ cts.	$ cts.	$ cts.	$ cts.	$ cts.	$ cts.
[2]Canadian Northern Telegraph Co.	57,960 96	2,808 01	..	..	..	..	11,614 78	..	17,309 53	89,693 28
Canadian Pacific Railway Co.	1,105,079 67	..	51,094 73	226,332 76	..	..	..	..	..	1,382,507 16
Dominion Government Telegraph Service.	402,596 61	5,829 84	†224,248 50	..	..	..	..	..	..	632,674 98
Grand Trunk Pacific Telegraph Co.	25,179 24	2,639 62	67,350 79	2,792 00	..	..	6,028 60	655 25	710 26	105,405 76
Great North Western Telegraph Co. of Canada	548,593 83	19,515 48	190,106 19	4,007 51	701 56	2,549 85	85,874 73	21,907 13	120,239 24	993,495 52
Halifax and Bermudas Cable Co., Ltd.	18,500 00	930 00	543 00	2,490 00	26 00	80 00	..	..	2,631 00	25,200 00
Marconi Wireless Telegraph Co. of Canada Ltd.	154,027 63	..	115,116 34	*	11 63	4,970 28	..	1,018 70	10,408 27	285,552 85
North American Telegraph Co.	4,601 16	73 02	827 58	95 00	4 00	256 80	7,281 73	848 15	7,652 80	21,640 24
Pacific Cable Board.	65,691 07	3,063 05	..	237 47	..	..	..	77 51	12,773 97	85,753 07
Temiskaming and Northern Ontario Railway Commission	2,375 00	466,98	6,308 44	..	..	..	4,040 30	..	..	13,190 72
Western Union Telegraph Co.	347,141 37	5,603 18	107,062 57	21,472 54	..	..	..	6,751 13	5,721 45	494,052 24
Total	2,735,956 57	40,979 18	762,658 14	257,427 28	743 19	7,856 93	114,840 14	31,257 87	177,446 52	4,129,165 82

* Included in "Maintenance of Line." [2] For half-year ended Dec. 31, 1914. † Includes maintenance of buildings.

TABLE 4.—Income Account for the Year ended June 30, 1915.

Name of Telegraph Company.	Gross Revenue.	Operating Expenses.	Net Operating Revenue.	Additions.					Gross Corporate Income.	
				Outside Operations.	Rents.	From Securities Held.	Other Income.	Total.	Income.	Loss.
	$ cts.	$ cts.	$ cts.	$ cts.	$ cts.	$ cts.	$ cts.	$ cts.	$ cts.	$ cts.
Canadian Northern Telegraph Co.	119,785 67	89,693 28	60,092 39						60,092 39	
Canadian Pacific Railway Co	2,504,241 50	1,382,507 16	1,121,734 34						1,121,734 34	
Grand Trunk Pacific Telegraph Co	75,268 01	105,405 76								30,137 75
Great North Western Telegraph Co. of Canada	1,283,342 93	971,588 39	311,754 54		11,119 48	1,312 50		12,431 98	324,186 52	
Halifax and Bermudas Cable Co., Ltd.	87,930 00	25,200 00	62,730 00						62,730 00	
Marconi Wireless Telegraph Co. of Canada	306,615 47	285,552 85	21,062 62						21,062 62	
North American Telegraph Co.	16,475 68	14,115 24	2,360 44	3,353 17	14 55			3,367 72	5,728 16	
Pacific Cable Board	113,657 52	85,753 07	27,904 45						27,904 45	
Temiskaming and Northern Ontario Railway Commission	24,912 01	13,190 72	11,721 29						11,721 29	
Western Union Telegraph Co.	732,364 70	494,052 24	238,312 46						238,312 46	
Totals	5,294,593 49	3,467,058 71	1,857,672 53	3,353 17	11,134 03	1,312 50		15,799 70	1,873,472 23	30,137 75

Table 4.—Income Account (*Continued*).

Name of Telegraph Company	Deductions.				Net Corporate Income.		Disposal of Net Corporate Income.					Balance to Profit and Loss.	
							Dividends.						
	Taxes.	Interest on Bonds.	Other Deductions.	Total Deductions.	Income.	Loss.	Common Stock.	Preferred Stock.	Sinking Fund.	Reserve	Total.	Cr.	Dr.
	$ cts.	$ cts.	$ cts.	$ cts.	$ cts.	$ cts.	$ cts.	$ cts.	$ cts.	$ cts.	$ cts.	$ cts.	$ cts.
*Canadian Northern Telegraph Co.	1,426 72			1,426 72	58,665 67							58,665 67	
Canadian Pacific Ry Co.					1,121,734 34							1,121,734 34	
Grand Trunk Pacific Telegraph Co.						30,137 75							30,137 75
Great North Western Telegraph Co. of Canada	21,907 13	20,000 00	20,231 09	62,138 22	262,048 30		†211,914 00			27,996 73	293,910 73	22,137 57	
Halifax and Bermudas Cable Co., Ltd.					62,730 00		15,000 00				15,000 00	47,730 00	
Marconi Wireless Tel. Co. of Canada					21,062 62							21,062 62	
North American Tel Co.	848 15		6,676 85	7,525 00		1,796 84							1,796 84
Pacific Cable Board					27,904 45							27,904 45	
Temiskaming and Northern Ontario Ry. Commission					11,721 29							11,721 29	
Western Union Telegraph Co					238,312 46							238,312 46	
Totals	24,182 00	20,000 00	26,907 94	71,089 94	1,801,179 13	31,934 59	226,914 00			27,996 73	254,910 73	1,549,268 40	31,934 59

* For six months ending Dec. 31, 1914. † Rental of leased lines.

TABLE 5.—Pole Mileage and Wire Mileage by Classes.

Name of Company.	Address.	Pole Mileage.		Wire Mileage.				
		Operated by Company.	Operated by Another Company.	Galvanized.	Copper Wire.			Multiple.
					Overhead.	Underground.	Submarine.	
		Miles.	Miles.	Miles.	Miles.	Miles.	Miles.	Miles.
Canadian Northern Telegraph Company	Toronto	6,387·60	75·00	19,013·90	603·80	51·70		450 00
Canadian Pacific Railway Co	Montreal	14,338 00		47,743·00	18,315·00	402·00	114·00	37,046 00
Dominion Government Telegraph Service	Ottawa	10,487·50		11,096·25	346·00		353·25	
Grand Trunk Pacific Telegraph Co.	Montreal	3,185·25		8,187·25	6,413·25			
Great North Western Telegraph Co. of Canada	Toronto	9,305·00		27,101·00	2,126 00	255·00	131·00	3,340 00
North American Telegraph Co	Kingston, Ont	44·00		661·00				
Temiskaming and Northern Ontario Ry. Com.	Toronto	330·00		1,407·00				
Western Union Telegraph Co.	New York	2,819·31		17,130·60	†8·40	†39·00	†51·10	*416 90
Totals		46,896 66	75·00	132,343·00	27,812·45	747·70	649·35	41,282 90

†Cables. *Conductor mileage.

Table 6.—Messages, Employees, Remuneration, etc.

Name of Company.	Address.	Number of Land Messages.	Number of Cable-grams.	Number of Operators		Number Other Officers and Employees.	Salaries and Wages.	Amount of Financial Paper Handled.
				Male.	Female.			
							$ cts.	
*Canadian Northern Telegraph Co	Toronto	580,930	4,012	60	5	129	60,910 06	
Canadian Pacific Railway Co	Montreal	3,584,423	247,846	431	91	1,015	1,183,427 94	590,061 79
Dominion Government Telegraph Service	Ottawa	377,849		780	122	168	402,596 61	
Grand Trunk Pacific Telegraph Co	Montreal	144,164		175	3	42	82,633 41	
Great North Western Telegraph Co. of Canada	Toronto	1,310,592	350,414	1,821	82	483	618,809 43	75,193 13
Halifax and Bermudas Cable Co., Ltd	London, Eng.						18,500 00	
Marconi Wireless Telegraph Co. of Canada, Ltd	Montreal	75,713	133,671	160		70	154,027 63	
North American Telegraph Co	Kingston, Ont.	81,035	3,974	38	16	4	4,601 16	
Pacific Cable Board	London, Eng.			40		18	69,601 07	
Temiskaming and Northern Ontario Ry. Com	Toronto	119,453	1,306	3	1	4	3,779 00	
Western Union Telegraph Co	New York	677,976	236,136	169	13	300	347,441 37	
Totals		9,952,135	977,389	3,677	333	2,233	2,946,327 74	665,254 92

* For six months ending Dec. 31, 1914.

Table 7.—Pole Mileage by Provinces.

Name of Company.	Nova Scotia.	New Brunswick.	Prince Edward Island.	Quebec.	Ontario.	Manitoba.	Saskatchewan.	Alberta.	British Columbia.	Yukon.
	Miles.	Miles.	Miles.	Miles.	Miles.	Miles.	Miles.	Miles.	Miles.	Miles
Canadian Northern Telepgrah Co..	.....	.....	.....	.....	963·40	*2,103·90	2,117·10	1,182·20	96·00	
Canadian Pacific Railway Co.....	543·00	462·00	....	1,246·00	3·953·00	1,730·00	2·776·00	1,885·00	1,743·00	
Dominion Government Telegraph Service.....	847·00	88·25	† 14·00	2,144·25	28·00	....	947·50	1,193·00	4,639·50	586·00
Grand Trunk Pacific Telegraph Co.	.....	.....	.....	.....	365·50	306·50	1,107·25	689·00	717·00	
Great North Western Telegraph Co of Canada.....	.....	455·00	.....	3,398·00	5·382·00	70·00	.....	.....	.....	
North American Telegraph Co.....	.....	.....	.....	....	44·00	....	....	.....	....	
Temiskaming and Northern Ontario Ry. Commission.....	.....	.....	.....	....	330·00	....	.....	....	.....	...
Western Union Telegraph Co.....	1,554 00	995 00	....	48 00	98·50	.....	.....	....	123·81	...
Total.....	2,944·00	2,000 25	14·00	6,836·25	11,164·40	4,210·40	6,947·85	4,949·20	7·319·31	586·00

*43·50 miles in State of Minnesota. †In Newfoundland.

Table 8.—Wire Mileage by Provinces.

Name of Company.	Nova Scotia.	New Brunswick	Prince Edward Island.	Quebec.	Ontario.	Manitoba.	Saskatchewan.	Alberta.	British Columbia.	Yukon.
	Miles.	Miles.	Miles.	Miles.	Miles.	Miles.	Miles.	Miles.	Miles.	
Canadian Northern Telegraph Co.	.....	.....	.....	.....	2,762·10	*7,673·00	6,176 80	3,315·50	192·00	.....
Canadian Pacific Railway Co.	2,577·00	2,878·00	.....	9,359·00	35,502·00	11,483·00	16,018·00	14,253·00	11,550·00	
Dominion Government Telegraph Service	993·50	118·25	14·00	2,398·00	45·00	.....	1,034·50	1,221·00	5,028·25	586·00
Grand Trunk Pacific Telegraph Co.	.....	.....	.....	.....	1,166 75	1,784·75	3,832·75	3,705·25	4,111·00	
Great North Western Telegraph Co. of Canada	.....	457·00	.....	10,774·00	20,778·00	944·00	.....	.....	.....	
North American Telegraph Co.	.....	.....	.....	.....	664 00	.....	.....	.....	.....	
Temiskaming and Northern Ontario Ry. Commission	.....	.....	.....	.....	1,407·00	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....
Western Union Telegraph Co.	7,903·95	5,237·55	.....	48·00	3,858·50	.....	.....	.....	628·00	
Total	11,474·45	8,690·80	14·00	22,579·00	66,183·35	21,884·75	27,062·05	22,494·75	21,866·25	586 00

*396·80 miles in State of Minnesota. †In Newfoundland.

TABLE 9.—Number of Offices by Provinces.

Name of Company.	Nova Scotia.	New Brunswick.	Prince Edward Island.	Quebec.	Ontario.	Manitoba.	Saskatchewan.	Alberta.	British Columbia	Yukon.	Total.
Canadian Northern Telegraph Co.	.....	.....	.....	.....	117	128	151	45	.....	.....	441
Canadian Pacific Railway Co.	26	24	.....	220	486	165	237	146	142	.....	1,446
Dominion Government Telegraph Service	126	30	†2	180	8	.....	26	31	450	17	870
Grand Trunk Pacific Telegraph Co.	.....	.....	.....	.....	14	14	53	30	22	.....	133
Great North Western Telegraph Co. of Canada	.....	40	.....	412	549	113	143	44	.....	*37	1,338
North American Telegraph Co.	.....	.....	.....	.....	46	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	46
Temiskaming and Northern Ontario Railway Commission	.....	.....	.....	.....	26	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	26
Western Union Telegraph Co.	136	65	.....	5	.....	.....	.....	.....	29	.....	235
Totals	288	159	2	817	1,246	420	610	296	643	54	4,535

*In the United States. † In Newfoundland.